



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



ASHMOLEAN LIBRARY  
OXFORD

---

Ex Libris

EDUARD FRAENKEL

Corpus Christi Professor of Latin, 1935–53

---

1970





3/2

Edward Fawcett  
Oxford 1935



THE  
AGAMEMNON OF ÆSCHYLUS;  
THE GREEK TEXT,

WITH  
A TRANSLATION INTO ENGLISH VERSE,  
AND  
NOTES CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY,

BY  
JOHN CONINGTON, B. A.  
FELLOW OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

LONDON:  
JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.

---

M.DCCC.XLVIII.

**OXFORD:**

**PRINTED BY T. COMBE, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY.**



## P R E F A C E.

---

**I**N the present work I have undertaken to perform two duties, which in English literature have been usually kept distinct, that of a translator and that of a philological commentator. Though there does not seem any reason in the nature of the case why a scrupulous attention to the text and an appreciation of the poetry of an author should exclude each other, it would appear to be a fact that in this country the two are rarely found together. In Germany the case is different: there is by no means so broad a line of demarcation drawn between them; and publications professing to exhibit both are very frequently to be seen. The explanation of this fact obviously is, that there both philology and poetry, in its widest sense, are subjects of very general interest; each is felt to have some national value, and a wish naturally arises among writers and readers to include both in one comprehensive view; while with us neither can be said to excite any great measure of thoughtful attention, so as to enter in any real extent into public education, and thus both are alike left to small classes of students, who, jealous of their own art, are slow to perceive its bearing on any other. However, though sufficiently connected, in my judgment, to admit of being handled in a single work, each of them involves many matters peculiarly its own: and on some of these it is here the place to say a few words.

It will not of course be expected that I should enter into a review of those who have preceded me in translating the

Agamemnon; but it would be mere affectation to deny that my own version has been continued, if not commenced, with the view of supplying certain requisites in which I conceive theirs to be deficient. These cannot be said so much to arrange themselves under any one head as to be dispersed under many; and my success, if I should be judged to have succeeded, will have been attained partly by trying to combine what my predecessors have attempted separately, partly by a different treatment of the several points proposed. Mr. Sewell has already aimed at giving a faithful representation of the language of his author. Dr. Kennedy has made an attempt, though a very partial one, to preserve some conformity with the Choral metres. Those who required nothing beyond a transfusion of Æschylus' spirit into the style of our own dramatists, have long since been satisfied by the masterly, though unequal work, of Mr. Symmons<sup>a</sup>. Except in the matter of the metres, I have aspired after nothing new even in degree: or if there be anything new, it consists simply in the thought that a transcript of the language of Æschylus, an approximation to his metre, and a reproduction of his spirit in the only way in which it can be reproduced, by the analogous forms of English poetry, might all be compassed by one and the same translator.

But I am not merely concerned with the relation in which

<sup>a</sup> I cannot dismiss in a single sentence a book to which I owe so much as I do to this translation. At the time when I first began to read the Agamemnon, it assisted me more than any one work to enter into the real spirit of Æschylus; and I have never since turned to it without receiving a similar impression. In spite of the carelessness discernible in many parts, especially in some of the Choral passages, and the weakness inseparable from a version which nowhere aims at avoiding diffuseness, the reader, I think, must

feel that here at least is one man who to a certain extent saw with the same eyes as his original. He is now, I believe, beyond the reach of praise, but his work cannot be allowed to fall into neglect, though it still continues in a first edition, after the lapse of more than twenty years, and attracted but little notice on its first appearance, except one short article in the *Classical Journal*, containing very qualified praise, and another, far more just, though not sufficiently discriminating, in *Blackwood's Magazine*.

I stand to previous translators of the *Agamemnon*: I must also speak of the views which are entertained in the present day on the subject of translation generally: the more so as it will enable me to develope more fully those notions with respect to the duties of a translator, which I have expressed somewhat loosely in the preceding sentence. I am far from thinking that these duties can be summed up in any dictum about literal or free translation<sup>b</sup>. There has been a reaction lately in this as in other matters, against the principles maintained in the last century: and men seem disposed to think that the true idea has never been understood till now. Articles have appeared by different writers of ability, in the only journal open to a full discussion of such questions, the *Classical Museum*, all of them asserting the necessity of a translator following the metre and words as well as the general sense of the original, and reprobating the notion that the author is to be made to speak as he would have spoken in English. Now to a certain extent there is no doubt truth in this: but as it is stated, I believe it to be founded on a misconception. The rule is undoubtedly that the author should be represented as completely as possible, in form no less than in spirit: whether this is to be done by giving in all cases the same words and the same metre, is another question. In the first place it must be observed, that in *words* at least absolute identity is impossible—even *καί* is not the same word as *and*; in form they are totally unlike; but in sense they are the same, that is, they are analogous to each other, the one standing to the Greek language in the same relation in which the other does to the English. Now, is not this analogy the real principle of translation? and does it not seem probable

<sup>b</sup> The same opinions have already been supported by substantially the same arguments in an article on Chapman's *Homer*, in the *Oxford and Cambridge Review*, No. V., the

authorship of which I here acknowledge, lest any one should suspect me of having appropriated the sentiments of another writer.



that a mere verbal and metrical conformity may in many cases be the way not to realize, but to violate it? How can we be said to give a true copy of a Greek expression when we substitute for it one made up of English words indeed, but conveying no meaning at all, or perhaps a harsh meaning to English ears? or how can we flatter ourselves that a composition which an English reader would regard as oddly-fashioned prose, with no harmony, is a facsimile of an *Æschylean Chorus*? We may admire their ingenuity, as we should admire a Chinese imitation of European workmanship, but we cannot approve of them as versions, unless we suppose translation to be an exception to the general rule of truth-speaking, which requires not that a statement should be verbally correct, but that it should convey a true impression. If purely classical forms of expression and purely classical metres can be naturalized among the English, well and good; but that must be done by original compositions; and till then a translation made on such a theory will not be likely to fulfil one of the principal objects of a book, that of attracting readers. At the same time, of course any approximation which can be made to the form of the original, consistently with the usages of our own tongue, should be sedulously laboured after: and even where a precise equivalent cannot be found, it will be well to seek something as near to it as possible. *Æschylus* should speak in English phrases and English metres: but he must also speak as *Æschylus*. Acting on this rule, I have, in the first Chorus, not only rendered the Greek anapæsts by English anapæsts, as being an indigenous metre, but have put vv. 185 &c. into a measure taken from a poem of Miss Barrett's (*The Cry of the Children*), which though not reducible to the same quantities as the original, bears some resemblance to it as it is ordinarily read. In other places I have attempted no such apparent conformity: for instance, in the first lines of the first strophe, I am as persuaded that the Greek dactylic measure is best represented by an English

heroic stanza, as I am of any acknowledged truth connected with the play. With regard to many parts of the choric metres, our ignorance of their effect in Greek ought to be enough to deter us from any attempt to reproduce them in another tongue, or at any rate in our own, for I do not feel myself qualified to pronounce an opinion on the success of the experiment in Germany<sup>c</sup>. Thus it will be seen that nothing very definite can be laid down with reference to the degree in which a translator should copy the form of his author, owing to the indeterminate state of our language and metre, which will vary at different periods. There are some measures now tolerably congenial to our language which our fathers would have regarded as unnatural and affected; and the breaking up of conventional forms of phraseology, which has been for some time past going on under the influence of such writers as Mr. Carlyle, will allow us to hazard many expressions which could not have been used twenty years ago. All that can be said is, Be natural: and the appeal is to the *αἴσθησις* of the individual, checked by the prospect of an ultimate reference to "the common sense of most." So, whatever may be thought of

<sup>c</sup> There are several German versions of the Agamemnon of comparatively recent date, all of them executed on the principle of exact metrical conformity. The most celebrated of them, Humboldt's (I am giving not my own opinion, but that which I have heard from Germans themselves), is still highly esteemed, but complained of for its extreme difficulty, as is that of H. Voss, who, in common with his father, is said to have completely spoiled his style by the habits of translation, so that their Pindar is pronounced to be harder than the original, while the first edition of the Homer, one of J. H. Voss's earliest attempts, is infinitely preferred to the second. Droysen's version, though not thought

equal to his translation of Aristophanes, is praised for its great ease, while in other respects, such as closeness to the text, it would appear to be deficient. Hermann, a severe judge in the case of a disciple of Müller, spoke of it to me as "luftig," flighty or frothy; and the little I have seen of it induces me to believe that much has been sacrificed to the wish of producing a translation in flowing language: e. g. he transforms ἀπλοία κενάγγει (v. 181) into "ruhmlose Rast," inglorious repose. Franz's work, printed along with his edition noticed below, I heard favourably mentioned: but it does not seem to have been before the public sufficiently long to have received any decided judgment.

On the visit  
to Hermann  
by Cassin  
see Hermann  
vol. I (1832)

my success, I can safely say that my general object has been to approximate as nearly to the external conditions of my author as the English language, viewed as a vehicle for poetry, would admit; and even in those instances (very few, I trust) where I appear to have deviated from them at all widely, to give a true impression of the thing said and the manner of saying it.

In adverting to my work as an annotator, I need only notice the two editions which have more immediately preceded mine in England, those of Mr. Peile and Mr. Paley. They happen to stand in some degree in opposition to each other, the notes of the one being written in English, and intended as a contribution to an "enlarged, practical, vivid, and therefore popular treatment of Greek literature," those of the other exhibiting a return to the old language, and as a general rule, to the old style of critical investigation. Though I cannot but respect the sagacity, terseness, and general good sense displayed by the latter, I must still consider that he, in common with others, has dwelt disproportionately on one of his predecessor's faults of execution, while so far as he differs from him in principle, he has shown a less complete view of the requirements of modern criticism. In spite of all the instances of prolixity, pseudo-philosophical refinement, and unpoetical phraseology, which can be collected from Mr. Peile's book, he seems to me to have done service to his generation by departing from the dogmatic style of note-writing, which rules without giving reasons, and thus tends to isolate philology from all other branches of knowledge, and seeking to introduce discussions which may claim a place in positive philosophy as dealing with facts of human nature, and consequently of human interest. This intention has been converted into "the idea of making *Æschylus* popular by English notes," and as such, stigmatised as "one of the wildest chimeras which ever entered the human brain<sup>d</sup>:" but, more candidly

<sup>d</sup> Dyer's *Tentamina Æschylea*, p. 29.

understood, it shows no absurdity, but a proper sense of what the coming age is likely to demand. If the study of the classics is to stand its ground in English education, it must be by connecting itself with subjects acknowledged to be of public concern: the histories must be treated by a historian, the poems by a man of poetical feeling, and the language in which both are conveyed must be analysed by one who is not indisposed to take a wide and philosophical survey. Mr. Peile is right too in supposing that, as a vehicle of such inquiries, English notes are necessary. The Latin language was admirably suited for notes written in the old style: theirs is indeed an essentially Roman spirit, a spirit averse from speculation and given to practically ruling matters. But for anything like subtle analysis, Latin is entirely out of place. There is nothing of the kind in the language: the broad generalities of Cicero will not do in unfolding some form of thought, or showing the fundamental notion of a particle; and as soon as commentators attempt such things, they get into a phraseology of their own, which certainly cannot be called Latin. It is surprising that writers who hold that "the chief business of criticism is to unravel the idioms and intricacies of language<sup>e</sup>," should maintain nevertheless that Latin is the best organ for it. It has indeed the advantage of being "brief, clear, and easy of remembrance:" but where the object is not to "get up" a book, but to enter into an author's forms of thought, and where consequently things should be fixed in the memory not so much by aptness of expression as by a real connection of ideas, such a recommendation will not be needed<sup>f</sup>. It has the advantage of being "readily understood by readers of all countries and all ages:" but it tends to form these

<sup>e</sup> Preface to Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon.

<sup>f</sup> A friend has suggested to me that Latin notes will be found best for schools, English for more ad-

vanced students: a distinction which it will be seen agrees with the opinion here expressed in favour of the latter.

into a body by themselves, with a craft of their own, which both learners and teachers regard as something far removed from ordinary life. So for writers it has "the advantage of technical terms and phrases which all scholars have agreed to use:" but for that very reason it contributes to foster what may be called *odium philologicum*, as a man, unless writing in a conventional and, as it has been sarcastically termed, parliamentary jargon, will not be likely to devote the head of a rival to the infernal gods merely because he has made a bad emendation<sup>g</sup>. Besides, these advantages might equally have been urged in favour of continuing to write philosophical works in Latin, a question which public opinion has now completely set at rest, without any prejudice, to say the least, to the interests of science. In the department of classical criticism the custom has lingered longer than any where else, partly from the plausibility of discussing a dead language in a dead language, partly, as observed above, from its suitableness to a particular kind of note-writing. Some have spoken of English notes as a condescension to the indolence of the age: I can only say that in a great many cases, for my own sake, I should infinitely have preferred writing Latin. It is so difficult in matters of mere verbal criticism, the adjustment of the merits of different readings or different interpretations, to avoid running into sameness on the one hand, or affectation, if not flippancy, on the other. In writing notes on Thucydides, a commentator may take refuge in the vocabulary supplied by history or geography; but a verbal critic soon exhausts his stock of ordinary phrases like "preferable" or "untenable," and even those which touch on specific merits or demerits, as "harsh," "unnatural," "in keeping with the

<sup>g</sup> That this is no exaggeration will appear from the following note of Lipsius on Tacit. Ann. I. 3. "Siculus ille momar (exprimit quod verum est a me indignatio) cum sua conjectura, *sed qui pluribus morum*

*vitiis insisteret, abeat Morboniam.*"

I am sorry to mention Orelli's Horace as affording a proof that even in our day some traces of this grossly vituperative spirit are still to be found.

context," and is almost led to wish for a language in which he can speak of an emendation as "*præclara*" without being supposed to award extravagant praise, and characterize a failure by the adverbs "*putide*," "*inepte*," "*perridicule*," yet convey no deadly insult. He must however be content to wait till English criticism has acquired a more definite terminology, consoling himself with the thought that when it is formed, its tendency to become jargon will be checked by its relationship to the talk of common life, its powers of invective by its general intelligibility. Of course there is a limit to the extent of discussion to be admitted in a commentary: and this the facility of writing English notes may induce an editor to overleap. It must be remedied however not by compelling him to move in fetters, but by enforcing on him the exercise of that discrimination which he would be expected to employ in ordinary work. This again is a matter of *αἴσθησις*, and cannot very well be reduced to a prescription. I am myself painfully conscious that my notes are likely to be blamed for offences of this nature. I have however been frequently driven into them by circumstances; a plain explanation has been given and generally received, till some editor has found fault with it as insufficient, and attempted to give a more philosophical one; so that in order to clear away the irrelevant or erroneous matter that has thus been not unfrequently accumulated, a subsequent writer has to deal with the subject in a manner more or less scientific and abstruse. We have unfortunately no philosophical grammar of sufficient authority to be made a regular standard of appeal, otherwise nothing would be required beyond merely indicating the point in question; as it is, almost every editor has a grammar of his own, and when he wishes to insist upon a grammatical position, he will either fall into obscurity from being technical, or incur the charge of prolixity and irrelevance by seeking to explain his meaning. But this is a misfortune

belonging not to English note-writing, but to the present state of philology: a writer in Latin would feel it to a much greater degree, and could only escape it by strictly confining himself to the opinions, as strictly as to the language, of older critics.

In Germany nothing much has been done for the Agamemnon since Klausen's edition, which is now well known to English scholars. In 1837 Haupt published the text with a large body of notes, which display considerable learning, but have scarcely any pretensions to critical merit. There is hardly any error in the existing MSS. and early editions, even though it may have been corrected so long ago as the time of Canter<sup>b</sup>, which he does not think capable of being defended, therein far surpassing Klausen (who is himself not slow at attempting to explain the inexplicable), while his own suggestions generally shew a great want of that felicity which is the especial praise of a critic. I have however found his edition useful, particularly as he has reprinted the Scholia, which it is a satisfaction to have consulted, though on this play their help is nearly worthless. Very recently an edition of the Orestea has appeared by Franz, with a translation on the opposite pages, executed by order of the king of Prussia, expressly for the purpose of stage representation. The few notes appended to the text are in German, very brief, and entirely critical. I have not examined them thoroughly, but what I have seen does not give me a very high opinion of them. He adopts several very questionable corrections of H. L. Ahrens, and altogether may be said to have corrupted the text far more than he has improved it<sup>i</sup>. I have been informed also that

<sup>b</sup> It would be hard to overrate the services which Canter has rendered to Æschylus. The state in which he left the text of the plays can only be appreciated by those who from a careful examination of

the MSS. readings know in what condition he found it.

<sup>i</sup> Hermann has reviewed the work in the Wiener Jahrbücher, besides writing a short tract with reference to it, "Der scenica in Æschyli Orestea."



another edition has been published within the last year by a Flemish scholar, whose name I could not learn: but the work is said not to be of much importance.

With regard to the text of the *Agamemnon*, it seems now to be generally agreed that it is rather from modern sagacity than from ancient testimony that help is to be expected for the future. The Medicean MS. appears to be the fountain from which all the other copies in our possession have been derived: and its resources, both actual and possible, must now be pretty well exhausted. Fourteen years ago, Captain Medwin, in the preface to his translation, raised hopes by announcing that some new MSS. had been discovered in the Escorial, and were then being collated by Mr. Fedor: but no further tidings have been heard of them; at least I have sought in vain for any. An inquiry on the subject which I addressed in 1843 to the readers of the *Classical Museum* yet remains unanswered, nor do any facts appear to have come to the ears of the scholars of Germany. Under these circumstances I have thought it needless to give a list of the various readings of MSS. and editions, as others have done, only noticing those which I considered of any consequence. My text is substantially that of Mr. Peile, which I have adopted as on the whole the most satisfactory groundwork to take. The question of the metres I have passed over entirely, feeling myself disqualified from dealing with it by my ignorance of the principles of music, modern as well as ancient, and of the facts bearing upon Greek accent and rhythm. It would be easy to divide the

The last I have read, but it is entirely restricted to questions of stage performance: the former I have unfortunately not been able to procure. From what he told me himself however respecting his opinion, I should judge that the article cannot have been a favourable one. I

was glad to hear from him at the same time that he still cherishes his intention of editing *Æschylus* himself, though his contemporaries seem to fear that a work deferred so long is not likely ever to be carried into execution.



verses of the Choruses into a certain number of feet of various kinds, but I should despair of giving or gaining a notion of choral melody and harmony by any such process. My apprehension is merely that of a man groping in the dark: and it is by such vague notions, feelings rather than thoughts, that I have been guided in my endeavours to set off against each strophe some English equivalent<sup>k</sup>. I have admitted none of my own conjectures into the text, simply because I did not see any of them to be sufficiently certain: had I been more satisfied with them I should not have scrupled to introduce them, as I have done in the case of others, since the question is not between the words of Æschylus and those of his editor (a fallacy which I have heard propounded), but between the report of transcribers, who seem generally to have been ignorant men, and in numbers of instances have been proved to have fallen into error, and the suggestions of the learned, who attempt on certain principles to restore the lost words of the author. There is of course a danger of erring on either side: and indeed the only way is to decide on each passage as it comes, as in the present play at least no *systematic* corruption has taken place, and consequently no systematic remedy can be applied. In some cases the old reading might have been allowed to pass had there not been a conjecture of great external and internal probability: in others, even in the absence of any plausible alteration, the text has carried its own condemnation with it: occasionally some correction, which had almost acquired a prescriptive right, has been disturbed, because it appeared to have been dictated by too narrow a view of the laws of language; in fact, it is impossible to enumerate the different reasons which have swayed me under different circumstances. I hope however I shall

<sup>k</sup> An English work has just been advertised, professing to unravel the whole secret of the Greek Chorus,

but I have not been able to consult it.

be found always to have had reasons, and in almost every instance to have made them intelligible, as an arbitrary rejection of the reading of another editor seems to me more offensive than an attempt to expose its weakness. The same may be said with regard to the explanatory part of the notes; writing, as I have done, for no one class of readers exclusively, and thus going beyond what had been my original intention to make a note only where I had something new to say, I have yet had to state my own opinion wherever it seemed required, in adopting no less than in rejecting a previous exposition. I can cordially join in the words of Mr. Paley<sup>1</sup>, with which I shall be glad to dismiss this notice of my own labours, “*Erunt fortasse quibus videar et de me ipso in hoc libro non admodum modeste, et contra aliorum sententiam invidiose atque arroganter dixisse. Volui profecto libere reprehendere quodcunque vel ridicula subtilitate disputatum vel prava interpretatione adumbratum putarem: malui etiam scribere, mihi videri hoc vel illud perperam expositum, quam affirmare, id ita esse. Accedit, quod quo magis familiariter cum lectoribus loquere, eo jucundior et facilius procedere solet oratio. Spero autem fore ut alii non minus libere, si quid ipse erravero, Æschylum a meis ineptiis vindicare velint, sive ii fuerint censores sive in posterum editores.*” (Prælectio p. xiii.)

After this discussion of the several points connected with my own share in the present work, it is surely allowable to say something of the play itself, and of Greek tragedy in general. No one can pretend that the subject has been exhausted in England: for my own part, I believe that there is yet much more to be done. In giving up Blair’s Lectures for Schlegel’s Dramatic Literature we can scarcely

<sup>1</sup> I ought to say that I had completed the notes on the first 500 lines before I procured Mr. Paley’s

edition, so that I have only been able to introduce a few notices of it in that part of the commentary.

be said to have done enough. If in the last century the critic was too much of a judge, in the present day he is too much of a worshipper. If it is true that criticism must aim at seizing the spirit of the whole, it is no less true that the fundamental idea can only be gained by a rigorous analysis of the parts. It is useless to seek to reach it *per saltum*, and pretend that we have thus attained to the standing-point from which the several details are to be viewed. In Germany many writers have arisen to question Schlegel's propositions, and reconsider the questions which he was thought to have closed<sup>m</sup>: but in England he is still regarded as the great authority on all matters relating to the ancient and modern drama<sup>n</sup>. Yet surely his very conception of the essence of Greek Tragedy may well be disputed. Inward liberty and external necessity are, according to him, the two poles of the tragic world. In this he has been followed by others, who regard Destiny as the predominating principle of Greek dramatic art. Others, who have seen that Euripides at least had in general as little conception of Destiny in the ordinary sense of the word as any modern dramatist, have still asserted it to be the mainspring of the older tragedy, and appealed triumphantly to Æschylus.

<sup>m</sup> Vischer, who enjoys the reputation of being one of the first æsthetical writers in Germany, discusses Schlegel's view of destiny with some severity in his work *Ueber das Erhabene und Komische*. Those who differ, as I should myself do, from many of his views, will yet see reason to admire the superior discrimination with which he has treated the subject. Gruppe too attacks Schlegel in his *Ariadne* (chap. XVIII.), though his own view of Destiny, as a mere result of poetry, is contrary to that maintained here, which supposes a belief in it only to have influenced poetry so far as it

happened to be held by a particular poet.

<sup>n</sup> An Article in the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, for Oct. 1843, is the only remarkable exception I know to the general feeling of admiration. It attacks Schlegel on the same ground as that taken here, and disproves his notion of Destiny by a similar reference to the seven plays of Æschylus, a fact which I did not recollect at the time of writing my remarks. Mr. Dyer has also recently made a protest to the same effect in the *Classical Museum*, No. XV.

Now, even setting aside the fact that *Æschylus'* particular belief has no more right to be represented as the mainspring of the older tragedy than the religious views of Milton as the fundamental principle of the British Epic, we shall find it hard to extract any single and uniform notion of Destiny from the seven plays. In the *Prometheus* necessity appears as a non-moral power couched behind the new order of things and impelling them towards their destruction; though even this cannot be asserted definitely, as *Prometheus'* foreknowledge, which appears coextensive with these operations, is evidently not so much absolute as contingent, and so differs greatly from any thing which we understand by the term. In the *Agamemnon* we have two destinies, but neither of them the same as the last mentioned: the one is the destiny of a race, which though arising from a moral fault, operates by a physical law: the other is entirely moral, extending over all mankind, and constituting what I have called the *Theogony of Good and Evil*, as described in vv. 730 sqq.; it coincides apparently with the former, as an instrument to work out its ends, and provides that those who are doomed to suffer for their fathers' crimes shall not be without crimes of their own. From this view the *Choe-phoræ* does not seem to differ: but in the *Eumenides* there is little which can be called Destiny: the Furies, who appear in the earlier part of the piece as the old gods of the *Prometheus*, are disappointed of their prey, and reconciled not by any satisfaction made to their requirement of blood for blood, but by a promise that they shall receive honour from a city in no way connected with *Orestes* except by the ties of friendship. In the *Septem contra Thebas* the Destiny is the family one of the *Labdacidæ*: yet here it does not seem to affect the siege of the city, which is the central object of the piece. In the *Persæ* the necessity is moral, giving to moderation the victory over overweening rashness, which is really no necessity at all, in the sense in which the idea is opposed to that of free-will: and in the *Supplices* we

see little even of this shadow of Schlegel's "unfathomable power." It is scarcely necessary to proceed to Sophocles and show that in his plays the so-called essential principle is not more uniformly displayed, sometimes as in the whole *Œdipodean* story, wearing the twofold form which it wears in the present play, sometimes, as in the *Ajax*, exerting a purely moral power, while in the *Philoctetes* the picture of a brave man struggling with misfortune, if indeed it constitute the essence of the drama, is in no way peculiarly Greek. The conclusion then to which we come is that though the religious belief of the Grecian poets undoubtedly influenced their plays, and caused them frequently to introduce some power, beyond that of man, as working out the catastrophe, it is by no means sufficiently uniform and consistent in its phases to deserve being crystallized as *Destiny*, and exhibited as the presiding genius of the national dramatic literature.

Schlegel's account of the *Agamemnon* is pleasingly and gracefully written, but cannot be pronounced satisfactory: though drawn out to some length, it leaves several striking features unnoticed, and altogether never rises above the ordinary height of contemplation. "It was the intention of *Æschylus*," he says, "in the *Agamemnon* to exhibit to us a sudden fall from the highest pinnacle of prosperity and renown into the abyss of ruin:" and so it was, but it was a great deal besides. He does not bring out the idea of *Nemesis*, which pervades the whole play, *Agamemnon* suffering not only for the crimes of his ancestors, nor yet for the death of *Iphigenia*, which is *Clytæmnestra's* part of the plea, but for the blood he has caused to be spilt, as is developed in the second choral ode, the prevailing notion of which is the retribution of Heaven on wealth and conquest, already executed in the case of *Troy*, and apparently demanding another victim. Indeed the whole character of the *Chorus*, set on by an irresistible impulse to prophecy against their will, if not unconsciously, and continually

showing that that must be, which when brought before them by Cassandra they cannot apprehend,—as it were stating premisses, yet invariably shrinking from the obvious conclusion,—is left untouched. All that he has to say about the first Ode—the most wonderful effort, I am inclined to think, of Grecian poetry—is that “in their songs they go through the whole history of the Trojan War, through all its eventful fluctuations of fortune, from its origin, and recount all the prophecies relating to it, and the sacrifice of Iphigenia, by which the sailing of the Greeks was purchased:” and it is only after the scene of Agamemnon’s entry that he makes the Chorus “begin to utter its dark forebodings.” In the conception of Clytæmnestra’s character too he does not go far beyond the surface. He does not delineate that power of intellect which reigns throughout her speeches—calm, self-contained, and occasionally prodigal in displaying its collectedness, as in the description of the beacon, of the captured city, and of her feelings during Agamemnon’s absence, in all of which she seems to say to the spectators, “though I have so much on my mind I can yet find time and thought for this.” Nor does he notice that she is something beyond a hypocrite—something of a fanatic, believing in some degree at least that the moral order of things is working itself out through her means, so that she is really inactive, while the Alastor is the true agent.

She seemed methought to live two lives in one,  
 Each well sufficing man’s unaided power,  
 One busied still with matters to be done,  
 While one apart sat on a sentry-tower  
 Watching the moral world, as hour by hour  
 Some birth fore-doomed kept struggling into light,  
 Till I could fancy that so bloody shower  
 Through other hands had issued, and unite  
 My willing voice with hers to curse the Alastor’s might °.

° MS. Poem.

In fact I know no way by which the old theory of the character of Cromwell, as half fanatic, half hypocrite, might have better been justified in point of intellectual consistency than by a reference to the Æschylean regicide. Its advocates might have found in her a case of a dissembler rejoicing over the dead with a religious feeling, and declaring, not as a bravado, but as a matter of personal conviction, "The Lord hath delivered him into my hand." Her comparative mildness too as a ruler might have been paralleled with that striking feature in the last scene where she discourages the vulgar threats of Ægisthus, and begs him not to shed blood *unnecessarily*, intimating that in their crime they had been but poor vessels in the hand of Providence, chosen out for a work which it would have been bliss to have avoided. "I have sought the Lord night and day that he would rather slay me than put me upon this work." Even now that our own countryman has begun to be differently estimated, it is interesting to dwell upon the comparison.

It has been said that Shakspeare's superiority to Æschylus can be judged of by weighing the Agamemnon against Macbeth. And this is to a great extent true; only we must not decide too hastily on simply dramatic grounds. The display of character in the Agamemnon, though masterly so far as it goes, is not nearly so wide as in Shakspeare's play; as much wonder is excited, but the whole subject is felt to be transacted upon an elevated platform, and not to come down to the level of common life. As in the Prometheus, little sympathy is raised, except for the abstract principle involved in the story, so that the spectator approaches cautiously, and is made to see that awe is his most appropriate sentiment. Shakspeare places his chief marvel in the development of a strictly human nature, aiming indeed at an object beyond the reach of common men, but actuated by mere human passions, and doing in reality no more than any



man might be tempted to do, though the sphere in which he moved were different. In the supernatural part of his piece I cannot but think that *Æschylus* has the advantage. The Grecian conceptions of Nemesis and the Alastor, the prophecies of Cassandra, seem to me more awful than the Gothic machinery of the witches, peculiarly adapted as it is to the country where the scene is laid. If Pagan ideas could produce so much, Christian ideas should have produced more. I am aware of the transcendent difficulty there is in embodying anything connected with our religion worthily in poetry: I merely say as a fact, that here the ancient dramatic art surpasses the modern. There can be no doubt however that the triumph of drawing the whole sublimity of a piece from human nature is higher than that which has recourse to mysterious supernatural powers to produce its effect. But it must not be forgotten that it is not merely on dramatic grounds that the *Agamemnon* is to be judged. Its lyrical parts, though intimately bound up with the catastrophe, have yet such surpassing power in themselves as to claim a large part of the admiration with which we regard the whole. It is not meant to deny that the existence of a Chorus is in itself a proof of a less perfect stage of the tragic art. Schlegel says it is meant to be the ideal spectator; but however well it may perform this function, and however necessary it may be that the function should be performed, a poet who can dispense with such a cumbersome engine and yet attain the desired object, by distributing the work to be done over the rest of the play, must be held to have made an advance as an artist. Still we ought not therefore to judge of a Greek tragedy merely by its dialogue, but regarding it as a poem, lyric as well as dramatic, to estimate the general sum of poetical power displayed. And viewing it in this light, as a product of an age when art was ruder, and human nature itself both developed in a rougher form and less completely apprehended, I



believe it will be found difficult to overrate the *Agamemnon*<sup>P</sup>.

If this be in any way a fair account of its excellences, a writer who succeeds in introducing it to the English public must be reckoned to have done a good work. I am far from supposing that so complete a praise will be accorded to me; but if from any part of my book, anything in the translation or the notes, the attention of the general reader shall be directed towards the original, I shall at least have achieved something. The work of a translator ceases when his author is well known; and he must indeed be taken up by personal vanity who would repine at being thus thrown into the shade. But there is no need at present to look for this time coming in sight. *Æschylus* is appreciated by some, read by others as a school-book, but to the great mass of the reading world entirely unknown, except perhaps by a few specimens from Potter. There is no royal road to be expected to the Greek plays, it is true; the labour of mastering, if not the original text, at least many facts connected with the mental history of the times, and not to be collected from merely reading a translation, can never be superseded. But it may be made more obvious, more popular, not by suppressing everything really characteristic and consequently difficult, but by associating the subject with matters of human interest, and making people feel that the Greeks were men with "the basis of the soul" the same as our own. Such representations as that which was recently witnessed of the *Antigone* are a step in the right direction, as

<sup>P</sup> Those who are well acquainted with the "mirror of human life" presented to us by Homer, may question this statement: and it is very likely that I have in some measure transferred the imperfections of the poet to the age.—Still, the view of human nature in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* seems to be less deep than

that in the *Agamemnon*, though much more complete—the one a picture glowing with all the freshness of childhood—the other a fragmentary sketch, but wrought up in parts to great intensity, and so approaching a stage nearer to the full realization of the dramatic power in Shakspeare.

showing that the life of Greek plays is not confined to books, but can be exhibited on the same boards which are trod nightly by the actors of modern pieces<sup>9</sup>. The process of familiarizing the minds of men in general with works originally written in a dead language centuries ago must always be a slow one, and with so many subjects of equal or greater importance equally neglected, its completion may have to wait for the arrival of such a system of education as we cannot now believe possible: but we are at all events capable of making some advance, and when the Athenian drama is as much canvassed and as well understood in England as in Germany, it will be time to consider whether our knowledge is sufficient to give us scope for satisfaction.

<sup>9</sup> It is rather premature to consider practically the question of the representation of the Agamemnon; but Hermann seems to be generally right against the Müller School,

Droysen and Franz, in supposing the primitive practice to have been extremely simple as regards both the stage apparatus and the character of the music.

# ΥΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ

## ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝΟΣ.

---

**Α**ΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ εἰς Ἴλιον ἀπὶ ὧν, τῇ Κλυταιμνήστρᾳ, εἰ πορθήσοι τὸ Ἴλιον, ὑπέσχετο τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρας σημαίνειν διὰ πυρσοῦ. ὅθεν σκοπὸν ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ μισθῷ Κλυταιμνήστρᾳ, ἵνα τηροίῃ τὸν πυρσόν. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἰδὼν ἀπήγγειλεν· αὐτὴ δὲ τὸν τῶν πρεσβυτῶν ὄχλον μεταπέμπεται, περὶ τοῦ πυρσοῦ ἐροῦσα· ἐξ ὧν καὶ ὁ χορὸς συνίσταται· οἵτινες ἀκούσαντες παιανίζουσι. μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ καὶ Ταλθύβιος παραγίνεται, καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν πλοῦν διηγείται. Ἀγαμέμνων δ' ἐπὶ ἀπήνης ἔρχεται· εἶπετο δ' αὐτῷ ἑτέρα ἀπήνη, ἔνθα ἦν τὰ λάφυρα καὶ ἡ Κασάνδρα. αὐτὸς μὲν οὖν προεισέρχεται εἰς τὸν οἶκον σὺν τῇ Κλυταιμνήστρᾳ. Κασάνδρα δὲ προμαντεύεται, πρὶν εἰς τὰ βασίλεια εἰσελθεῖν, τὸν ἑαυτῆς καὶ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος θάνατον, καὶ τὴν ἐξ Ὀρέστου μητροκτονίαν, καὶ εἰσπηδᾷ ὡς θανουμένη, ῥίψασα τὰ στέμματα. τοῦτο δὲ τὸ μέρος τοῦ δράματος θαυμάζεται, ὡς ἑκπληξιν ἔχον καὶ οἶκτον ἱκανόν. ἰδίως δὲ Αἰσχύλος τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα ἐπὶ σκηνῆς ἀναιρεῖσθαι ποιεῖ· τὸν δὲ Κασάνδρας σιωπήσας θάνατον, νεκρὰν αὐτὴν ὑπέδειξε. πεποιήκε τε Αἰγισθον καὶ Κλυταιμνήστραν, ἑκάτερον διῶσχυριζόμενον περὶ τῆς ἀναιρέσεως, ἐνὶ κεφαλαίῳ· τὴν μὲν, τῇ ἀναιρέσει Ἰφιγενείας· τὸν δὲ, ταῖς τοῦ πατρὸς Θυέστου ἐξ Ἀτρέως συμφοραῖς.

Ἐδιδάχθη τὸ δράμα ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Φιλοκλέους, Ὀλυμπιάδι ὀγδοηκοστῇ, ἔτει δευτέρῳ. πρῶτος Αἰσχύλος Ἀγαμέμνονι, Χοηφόροις, Εὐμενίσι, Πρωτεί σατυρικῷ. ἐχορήγει Ξενοκλῆς Ἀφιδνεύς.

# ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ.

## ΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΔΡΑΜΑΤΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΑ.

ΦΥΛΑΞ.

ΧΟΡΟΣ ΓΕΡΟΝΤΩΝ.

ΚΛΥΤΑΙΜΝΗΣΤΡΑ.

ΤΑΛΘΥΒΙΟΣ ΚΗΡΥΞ.

ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ.

ΚΑΣΑΝΔΡΑ.

ΑΙΓΙΣΘΟΣ.

# ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ.

## ΦΥΛΑΞ.

ΘΕΟΥΣ μὲν αἰτῶ τῶνδ' ἀπαλλαγὴν πόνων,  
φρουρᾶς ἐτείας μῆκος, ἣν κοιμώμενος  
στέγαις Ἀτρειδῶν ἄγκαθεν, κυνὸς δίκην,  
ἄστρον κάτοιδα νυκτέρων ὁμήγυριν,  
καὶ τοὺς φέροντας χεῖμα καὶ θέρος βροτοῖς  
λαμπροὺς δυνάστας, ἐμπρέποντας αἰθέρι  
[ἀστέρας, ὅταν φθίνωσιν, ἀντολάς τε τῶν].  
καὶ νῦν φυλάσσω λαμπάδος τὸ σύμβολον,  
αὐγὴν πυρὸς, φέρουσιν ἐκ Τροίας φάτιν  
ἁλώσιμόν τε βάξιν· ὧδε γὰρ κρατεῖ,  
γυναικὸς ἀνδρόβουλον ἐλπίζον κέαρ.

5

10

1. μὲν seems to be followed, not as Peile supposes, by καὶ v. 8, but by δὲ vv. 12, 16, the two continuing acts, αἰτῶ and φυλάσσω, being thus contrasted with the intermittent and repeated act, αἰδεῖν ἢ μινύρεσθαι δοκῶ.

2. μῆκος, the accusative of duration, a notion which has been extended by some to ἣν following; but there Haupt properly connects κοιμώμενος with φρουράν, as a cognate accusative.

3. ἄγκαθεν for ἀνέκαθεν has the authority of Hesychius, who apparently refers to this passage, ἀγρίαθεν (ἄγκαθεν). ἀνέκαθεν. Αἰσχύλος Ἀγαμέμνονι. The ordinary sense ἐν ἀγκάλαις however appears better, not

only as avoiding the question whether ἀνεκ— as well as ἀνακ— can be contracted into ἀγκ—, but as agreeing better with the position of the word before κυνὸς δίκην, words which would rather have been connected with κοιμώμενος had the point of the comparison ended there.

7. Dindorf and Blomfield, after Valckenaer on Eurip. Phœn. 506, regard this line as spurious; and as it adds nothing to the sense, and seems at any rate awkwardly expressed, I have enclosed it in brackets, taking no notice of it in the translation. Æschylus can hardly be supposed to have wished to contrast ἀστήρ and ἄστρον, according to the distinction made by the gram-

# AGAMEMNON.

## WATCHMAN.

**A** RIDDANCE am I asking of the gods  
From these my toils, this watch a whole year long  
Which plying, as I lie, propped on my arm  
Upon the Atridæ's house-top, like a dog,  
I have learnt the congress of the nightly stars,  
And those who bring to mortals cold and heat,  
Bright potentates, set proudly in the sky.  
And now I am watching for the signal torch,  
The flame of fire, bearing from Troy a tale,  
The tidings of its fall: for so is best,  
Since my queen's manlike spirit waits in hope.

marians. Bamberger's explanation, referring ἀστέρης κ. τ. λ. not to τοὺς φέροντας, but more loosely, to all the accusatives preceding, will scarcely be urged in arrest of judgment.

10. 11. ὦδε γὰρ κρατεῖ κ. τ. λ. I attach no very great importance to the interpretation of these words which I have adopted in my version, and expressed in the text by placing a stop after κρατεῖ: it seems however certainly admissible. κρατεῖ would of course have the sense it bears in v. 1331, κατθανεῖν κρατεῖ, ἀνδρόβουλον ἐλπίζον κέαρ being in the nom. or acc. absolute.—Is there any necessity for grammarians to assume the existence of an accusative absolute at all? All the instances I have seen where the case is really absolute, and not a mere accusa-

tivus de quo, are of neuter words either singular or plural, and may just as well be nominatives, while there are many nominatives absolute which cannot possibly be accusatives. The only one of the examples in Jelf's Gr. Gr. which will not bear such a solution is from Plato Gorg. p. 495 C. ἄλλο τι οὖν . . ὥς ἕτερον τὴν ἀνδρείαν τῆς ἐπιστήμης, δύο ταῦτα ἔλεγες; where the case in question may fairly be held to be governed by ἔλεγες either in itself, or as supplying a participle,—the construction being ἄλλο τι οὖν (λέγων) ὥς (as in Æsch. Prom. 629.) ἕτερον τὴν ἀνδρείαν κ. τ. λ. "Was it asserting any thing beyond a distinction between ἀνδρεία and ἐπιστήμη, that you spoke of them as two things?"

εὖτ' ἂν δὲ νυκτίπλαγκτον ἔνδροσόν τ' ἔχω  
 εὐνήν ὀνείροις οὐκ ἐπισκοπούμενην  
 ἐμὴν, φόβος γὰρ ἀνθ' ὕπνου παραστατεῖ,  
 τὸ μὴ βεβαίως βλέφαρα συμβαλεῖν ὕπνῳ, 15  
 ὅταν δ' αἰδεῖν ἢ μινύρεσθαι δοκῶ,  
 ὕπνου τόδ' ἀντίμολπον ἐντέμνων ἄκος,  
 κλαίω τότε οἴκου τοῦδε συμφορὰν στένων,  
 οὐχ, ὥς τὰ πρόσθ', ἄριστα διαπανουμένου.  
 νῦν δ' εὐτυχὴς γένοιτ' ἀπαλλαγὴ πόνων 20  
 εὐαγγέλου φανέντος ὀρφναίου πυρός.  
 ὦ χαῖρε, λαμπτήρ νυκτός, ἡμερήσιαν  
 φάος πιφαύσκων, καὶ χορῶν κατάστασιν  
 παλλῶν ἐν Ἀργεῖ, τῇσδε συμφορᾶς χάριν.  
 ἰοὺ ἰοῦ. 25

Ἀγαμέμνωνος γυναικὶ σημαίνω τορῶς,  
 εὐνῆς ἐπαντείλασαν ὥς τάχος δόμοις  
 ὀλολυγμὸν εὐφημοῦντα τῇδε λαμπάδι  
 ἐπορθιάζειν, εἶπερ Ἰλίου πόλις  
 ἐάλωκεν, ὥς ὁ φρυκτὸς ἀγγέλλων πρέπει. 30

12-16. εὖτ' ἂν and ὅταν are not meant as two different ways of beginning the same sentence, nor is there any need of assuming an anacoluthon, much less of correcting the text. The apparent difficulty arises from the interposition of the parenthesis φόβος — ὕπνῳ, which made it necessary to introduce a second δὲ after ὅταν, for the purpose of shewing that ὅταν was intended to be connected with εὖτ' ἂν as the protasis of the sentence. Thus the watchman's attempts to sing or whistle are marked as occurring *during* the time of his lying on his bed; and it is during both these periods, that of lying and that of singing, that he bewails the fortune of the family.—δοκῶ I take in its natural sense, 'while I seem to be

singing or whistling,' implying that while others might think, or even while he might fancy himself that he was striking up a merry tune, it was really a strain of sorrow; and so of course in a moment he would find that his song was different from what he had designed it to be. There seems no occasion to have recourse to the meaning ὅταν δοκῇ μοι, however proper that may be in other passages.

21. φανέντος, from its vagueness, may signify either 'when it shall have appeared,' or, 'now that it has appeared:' but the whole context seems in favour of the former. The translation too may bear both senses.

22. ἡμερήσιον refers rather to a moral than to a physical daylight,

But while night-wandering and dew-drenched I keep  
 This couch of mine, ne'er looked upon by dreams,  
 For at my side in place of sleep stands fear,  
 That so mine eyes ne'er close in lasting sleep—  
 But when I seem to sing or chirp awhile,  
 Compounding for lost sleep this vocal cure,  
 Then am I wailing deep this house's chance,  
 No longer best controlled, as once it was.  
 Now may glad riddance of these toils be mine,  
 As through the gloom beams out the herald of joy.  
 O hail, thou beacon of the night, forth showing  
 A daylight radiance, and the setting up  
 Of many a quire in Argos, for this chance!  
 Io! Io!  
 To Agamemnon's wife I give clear charge  
 To spring up from her bed, and in the house  
 Upraise a shouting for this beacon-light  
 In welcome, if the town of Ilion  
 Is taken, as the torch stands forth to tell.—

though undoubtedly allusion is made to the latter in the contrast with *νυκτός*. 'Thou *night*-beacon, that yet showest forth a beam as good as day!'

30. *πρέπει* may possibly bear the active sense which Buttmann (*Lexilogus* under *θεοπρόπος*) would attribute to it; but there is no reason why it should not be taken here in what is generally considered to be its primary acceptation, that of a thing forcing itself upon any sense: whether it be as here, the sense of sight, that of hearing, as in v. 310, or that of smell, as in v. 1278. The connection between this meaning of the word *πρέπει* with the more ordinary one of becoming or befitting may be found in the notion of *seeming natural*, a vivid impression begetting in the mind a feeling of association, so that a thing which

has struck the senses appears the natural thing to expect under similar circumstances: e. g. *ὁμοιος ἀρμὸς ὥσπερ ἐκ τάφου πρόπει*, where the odour coming from the tomb and striking upon the smell is held to belong to the tomb. In much the same way the notion of *appearing* in our word *seem* passes into that of *natural fitness* in *seemly* and *beseem*. Can there be a connection between *πρέπειν* and *proprius* or *proper*? There is certainly a curious coincidence between this double meaning of *πρέπων* and the senses of *proper*, as 'a proper man,' which might be translated *πρέπων ἀνὴρ*. *Prope*, the natural root of *proprius*, may be of the same family of words, the notion of proximity in space being connected with that of association in the mind—not to mention its own origin from *pro*, which connects it at



αὐτός τ' ἔγωγε φροῖμιον χορεύσομαι.  
 τὰ δεσποτῶν γὰρ εὖ πεσόντα θήσομαι,  
 τρίς ἔξ βαλούσης τῆσδέ μοι φρυκτωρίας.  
 γένοιτο δ' οὖν μολόντος εὐφιλή χέρα  
 ἄνακτος οἴκων τῇδε βαστάσαι χερί.

35

τὰ δ' ἄλλα σιγῶ· βοῦς ἐπὶ γλώσση μέγας  
 βέβηκεν· οἶκος δ' αὐτός, εἰ φθογγὴν λάβοι,  
 σαφέστατ' ἂν λέξειεν· ὥς ἐκὼν ἐγὼ  
 μαθοῦσιν αὐδῶ, κοῦ μαθοῦσι λήθομαι.

## ΧΟΡΟΣ.

δέκατον μὲν ἔτος τόδ', ἐπεὶ Πριάμου  
 μέγας ἀντίδικος,

40

Μενέλαος ἄναξ ἡδ' Ἀγαμέμνων,  
 διθρόνου Διόθεν καὶ δισκήπτρου  
 τιμῆς, ὄχυρόν ζεῦγος Ἀτρειδῶν,  
 στόλον Ἀργείων χιλιοναύταν  
 τῇσδ' ἀπὸ χώρας

45

ἦραν, στρατιῶτιν ἄρωγαν,  
 μέγαν ἐκ θυμοῦ κλάζοντες Ἄρη,  
 τρόπον αἰγυπίων,

οἷτ' ἐκπατίοις ἄλγεσι παίδων

50

once with Buttmann's derivation of *πρέπω* from *πείρω*, *περάω*, to push forward.

32. *φρυκτωρία* has been taken by Stanley and Butler as the watching for rather than the kindling of the fire; but the notion of *watching* contained in the word appears to refer to those who *give*, not to those who *observe* the signal,—so that the full sense would be, 'a giving attention to a beacon,' and hence 'a beacon-lighting,' which is undoubtedly the meaning in v. 471.

35. *βαστάσαι* here would seem to represent the intermediate notion

between that of supporting and that of merely touching, in which it is used by Soph. Œd. C. 1101, the grasping of the hand being more than a touch, yet less than a support.

36. The general point of *restraint*, as denoted by *βοῦς*, is clear, whatever may be the precise force of the metaphor. That the watchman does not mean to say that he has been bribed is plain from the tone of his speech throughout.

49. *τρόπον αἰγυπίων*. I have sometimes thought that Euripides may have imitated this passage in *Troad*.

And I will dance the prelude here myself.  
 For I shall score my master's game as fair,  
 Now that this torch hath thrown me good thrice six.  
 O may I then in this my hand support  
 The dear hand of the mansion's lord, when come!  
 But soft—the rest is silence—a huge ox  
 Has passed upon my lips; but the house itself,  
 Could it find tongue, would tell the tale I mean  
 Excellent well:—for me, to those who know  
 I'd speak—to those who don't—why—I've forgotten.

CHORUS.

This year is the tenth since to plead their right  
 'Gainst Priam with arms in the court of fight,  
 Two monarchs of throned and sceptred reign,  
 Vicegerents of Zeus, the Atridæ twain,  
 Led from this coast their warlike host,  
 With a thousand vessels to cross the main;  
 From their soul fierce battle crying,  
 Like parent vultures at heart deep stung  
 With a wandering grief for their late-lost young,

128. The received text there is very different, *πλεκτὰν Αἰγύπτου παιδείαν ἐξηγήσασθ'*, where commentators talk about "the Egyptian art of rope-making." It would involve but a very slight change to read *πλαγκτὰν αἰγυπιοὶ παιδείαν ἐξηγήσασθ'*, "ye went as vultures to demand back their stray brood," Euripides having gone a step further than Æschylus, and turned the *εἰκὼν* into a *μεταφορά*. In Æsch. Prom. 709, *πλεκτὰς στέγας*, Dacier conjectures *πλαγκτὰς*.

50. *ἐκπατίοις ἄλγεσι* is taken by Peile and others after the Scholiast on the old principle of Hypallage to mean, 'grief for the loss of their young:' but had the expression been *ἐκπατίων παίδων*, there would

still be a harshness in describing the stealing of the young birds as 'a removal from the beaten path.' Symmons' version, 'mourning apart in deep untrodden glades,' is poetical, but scarcely agrees with what follows, *ὑπατοὶ λεχέων*, as *ἐκπατίοις* in this connection would signify 'away from their own paths' rather than 'from the paths of others,' even if it were admitted that Æschylus would be likely to speak of a place which had just been invaded by the tread of the spoiler as *ἐκπάτιον*, whatever it may have been considered before. The sense adopted by Klausen, 'extravagant, excessive,' seems perfectly unobjectionable.

ὑπατοὶ λεχέων στροφοδινοῦνται,  
 πτερύγων ἐρετμοῖσιν ἐρεσσόμενοι,  
 δεμνιοτήρη

πόνον ὀρταλίχων ὀλέσαντες.

ὑπατος δ' αἰῶν ἧ τις Ἀπόλλων,  
 ἧ Πᾶν, ἧ Ζεὺς οἰωνόθροον  
 γόον ὀξυβόαν τῶνδε μετοίκων,  
 ὑστερόποινον

55

πέμπει παραβᾶσιν Ἑρινύν.

οὕτω δ' Ἀτρέως παῖδας ὁ κρείσσων

60

ἐπ' Ἀλεξάνδρῳ πέμπει ξένιος

Ζεὺς, πολυάνορος ἀμφὶ γυναικὸς

πολλὰ παλαίσματα καὶ γυιοβαρῇ,

γόνατος κονίασιν ἐρειδομένου,

διακναιομένης τ' ἐν προτελείοις

65

κάμακος, θήσων Δαναοῖσιν

Τρωσὶ θ' ὁμοίως. ἔστι δ' ὅπη νῦν

ἔστι· τελεῖται δ' ἐς τὸ πεπρωμένον·

οὔθ' ὑποκλαίων, οὔθ' ὑπολείβων,

οὔτε δακρύων, ἀπύρων ἱερῶν

70

53, 54. The interpretation of πόνον ὀλέσαντες as 'labour lost,' is not so unpoetical as Symmons would represent it, nor does it require the use of δεμνιοτήρης in the sense of 'guarding a bed:' still, there seems good reason for adopting his own translation of πόνον as equivalent to τὰ πεπονημένα, which will include the other, as a sense of the loss of the objects of labour implies a sense of the loss of labour itself. So Eurip. Phoenissæ 30, Herc. Fur. 1039, (quoted by Symmons and Butler).

57. Of the sense of μετοίκων there can be little doubt. Zeus is supposed to be lord of the air: the birds are sojourners in his realm, and appeal to him as the μέτοικοι

would to the Athenian government in case of a wrong. Such a fancy, as Klausen justly remarks, gave a handle to Aristophanes for representing the birds as turning the tables against the gods, and founding a city in the air.—It signifies little whether the stop be put after ὀξυβόαν or μετοίκων.

65. The peculiar force of προτέλεια must not be overlooked. Elsewhere it may mean generally an inaugural rite, as in v. 217, and still more generally, as in v. 697, any thing preliminary: but here it refers specially to the sacrifice before marriage, the combat being regarded as part of Helen's bridal ceremony, like Virgil's (Æn. VII. 518) San-

On the steerage broad of their oary flight,  
 Wheel over their nests on the tree's dim height;  
 For it is not there, their nursling care,  
 In the cradle safely lying.  
 But there is who sits on a throne above,  
 An Apollo, a Pan, or perchance a Jove,  
 And he lists to the shrill, the embittered cry  
 Of the tenants who dwell in his realm of sky,  
 And Erinny's is sped, with her slow sure tread,  
 To o'ertake the offender's flying.  
 Thus Zeus, the lord of the rights of friends,  
 'Gainst Priam's son the Atridæ sends—  
 Alas! in the cause of a much-wooed wife,  
 How many a day of soul-wasting strife,  
 When the limbs their weight can scarce sustain,  
 And the spent knee leans on the dusty plain,  
 And the spear snaps short in that fearful sport,  
 Alike for the Greek and the Trojan eke  
 Was his sovereign purpose framing!  
 Well—as things are now so things must be;  
 All join in the working of fate's decree—  
 Not the secret moan, nor the sprinkled wine,

guine Trojano et Rutulo dotabere,  
 virgo, Et Bellona manet te pro-  
 nuba.

70. It is more easy to object to the various interpretations which have been proposed for ἀνύρων ἱερῶν than to suggest a better. The old one, referring to the sacrifices of the Furies, has been exploded by Blomfield, on the strength of Eum. 106-9; for though Butler (*curæ secundæ* apud Peile) shews that a similar discrepancy might be pointed out between Eum. 107 and Eurip. Orest. 113, it is scarcely credible that a writer would contradict himself, especially in two plays of the same Trilogy. Blomfield's own interpretation of sacrifices unpaid by

Paris is rather jejune, and does not harmonize with the context, which makes the offence one of commission rather than of omission. Scholefield, followed by Peile, *may* be right in supposing the allusion to be to the Fates (an opinion recognised by the Scholiast, who explains τῶν Μοιρῶν καὶ τῶν Ἐρινύων, and certainly supported by τὸ πεπρωμένον preceding), but he scarcely can be right in construing ἱερῶν *sacred persons*, in spite of the gloss of Hesychius, ἱεραὶ ἀρχουσαι. Mitchell (Appendix to Aristoph. Frogs) suggests that the sacrifices of Zeus Xenius may have been ἀνύρα, or the word may mean 'unpropitious,' not consumed by fire, and thus shewing

ὀργὰς ἀτενεῖς παραθέλξει.  
 ἡμεῖς δ' ἀτίτα σαρκὶ παλαιᾷ,  
 τῆς τότε ἄρωγῆς ὑπολειφθέντες  
 μίμνομεν, ἰσχὺν  
 ἰσόπαιδα νέμοντες ἐπὶ σκήπτροις. 75  
 ὃ τε γὰρ νεαρὸς μυελὸς στέρνων  
 ἐντὸς ἀναίσσων  
 ἰσόπρεσβυς, Ἄρης δ' οὐκ ἔνι χώρα·  
 τό θ' ὑπεργήρων, φυλλάδος ἤδη  
 κατακαρφομένης, τρίποδας μὲν ὁδοὺς 80  
 στείχει, παιδὸς δ' οὐδὲν ἀρείων  
 ὄναρ ἡμερόφαντον ἀλαίνει.  
 σὺ δέ, Τυνδάρεω  
 θύγατερ, βασίλεια Κλυταιμνήστρα,  
 τί χρέος; τί νέον; τί δ' ἐπαισθομένη, 85  
 τίνος ἀγγελίας  
 πειθοῖ, περίπεμπτα θυοσκινεῖς;

the displeasure of the gods, as in Soph. Ant. 1006. ἐκ δὲ θυμάτων Ἡφαιστος οὐκ ἔλαμπε· but the first is little better than a mere conjecture, while the second is open to the same objections which have been urged against Blomfield's. Bamberger, followed by Dindorf and Linwood, has no doubt that the sacrifice of Iphigenia is intended, ἀπύρων ἱερῶν having the sense of 'an atrocious sacrifice,' 'one which ought never to have been offered;' but though ἀθύρων may be given as an interpretation of ἀπύρων, Æschylus would hardly have spoken of Iphigenia as a *burnt-offering*, and here it does not seem probable from the connection of thought, which is apparently dwelling on no sins but those of the Trojans, that he alludes to her at all. A better view of the passage is one communicated to me by Mr. Lingen of Balliol College,

who takes the ἱερὸν to be the sinner himself, ἀπύρων being added, *more Æschyleo*, as a qualifying epithet, and compares Eum. 294, 5, where καθιερωμένος answers to ἱερῶν, and ζῶν οὐδὲ πρὸς βωμῷ σφαγεῖς modifies the sense. In my translation I have been purposely vague; the words as there given will I think bear any interpretation, except perhaps the two latter, according to which ὀργὰς ἱερῶν can scarcely be rendered 'a wrathful shrine.'

76. Klausen recalls the old reading (altered by Stanley) ὅτε γὰρ νεαρὸς . . . . τότε ὑπέργηρως, supposing the meaning to be 'when youth passes into age, then the old man hobbles forth,' &c.: but the sense of ἰσόπρεσβυς, as referring to something which though *not* old age, is *like* it, is fixed by ἰσόπαιδα before: and the point of the poet's thought is evidently not the *transition* from youth

Nor the tear will appease that wrathful shrine,  
 Where no victim fire is flaming.  
 But we with unhonoured frames and old,  
 Left out erewhile of that muster bold,  
 Lag here, and lean, in neglected sort,  
 Our child-like strength on the staff's support;  
 For the marrow that leaps young breasts within,  
 Like the sap of the old, is but weak and thin,  
 While Mars not yet on his throne is set;  
 And helpless age, when its leaves decay,  
 Moves, frail as a child, on its three-legged way,  
 And crawls in the beam like a pale lost dream,  
 Which the noontide glare is shaming.  
 But thou, my queen, Clytemnestra, thou,  
 King Tyndareus' daughter, what tidings now?  
 What sight has thy watchful eye received,  
 What flattering tale has thy soul believed,  
 That the feast thou thus preparest?

to age, which, so far as the context here is concerned, need not have been physically connected at all, as two stages of human life, but simply the *similarity* between the two in respect of strength—a resemblance which would have been equally to the purpose, if noted between two entirely different things.

77. I have adopted Hermann's correction *ἀνάσσω* for *ἀνάσσω*, the iota subscript being, as Dindorf remarks, usually omitted in MSS. In the parallel variation in Persæ 96. *τίς ὁ κραίηνῳ ποδὶ πηδήματος εὐπετοῦς ἀνάσσω* (*ἀνάσσω* Turn. and Vict.), *ἀνάσσω* seems on the whole the better reading, as expressions like 'lord of the facile leap' are quite in the style of Æschylus, and much more natural than the enallage supposed by Brunck and Blomfield, or Linwood's explanation of *πηδήματος εὐπετοῦς* as an attributive of *ποδὶ*, and equivalent to *εὐπετῶς πηδῶντι*. (To

the same effect J. Wordsworth in Philog. Museum, quoted by Dindorf on Persæ l. c.)

78. *Ἄρης δ' οὐκ ἐνὶ χώρῃ*. Dr. Arnold understood this passage to mean 'the warriors are not in the land,' supposing the Chorus to be speaking of the three classes of inhabitants, the old, the fighting men, and the young; but the whole tenor of the expressions used seems to shew that the thought of those who are gone has been for the time dismissed, and that the mind of the old men is engaged in pursuing a reflection on the parallel between childhood and old age generally, suggested by the sense of their own weak and helpless state.

87. *θυοσκινείς*. I have held myself at liberty here and in other places to represent a reading in the translation which I have not adopted in the text. *θυοσκείς* gives a parœmiac, and so happens to suit my

πάντων δὲ θεῶν τῶν ἀστυνόμων,  
 ὑπάτων, χθονίων,  
 τῶν τ' οὐρανίων τῶν τ' ἀγοραίων, 90  
 βωμοὶ δώροισι φλέγονται·  
 ἄλλη δ' ἄλλοθεν οὐρανομηκῆς  
 λαμπὰς ἀνίσχει,  
 φαρμασσομένη χρίματος ἄγνου  
 μαλακαῖς ἀδόλοισι παρηγορίαις, 95  
 πελάνῳ μυχόθεν βασιλείῳ.  
 τούτων λέξας' ὅ τι καὶ δυνατόν,  
 καὶ θέμις αἰνεῖν,  
 παιῶν τε γενοῦ τῇσδε μερίμνης,  
 ἧ νῦν τότε μὲν κακόφρων τελέθει, 100  
 τότε δ' ἐκ θυσιῶν ἀγανὰ φαίνουσ'

immediate purpose, though its authority as a reading is very doubtful. In all other respects I have endeavoured to adhere strictly to the anapæstic system as it stands in the Greek text.

95. Without going so far as Peile (whose note Mitchell in his Appendix to Aristoph. Frogs characteristically approves), and supposing the words ἀδολοι παρηγόριαι to contain a side-blow at the δολία Πειθῶ which they stigmatize as the political ulcer of the Athenian democracy, we may suppose the 'soothing of the unadulterated oil' to have reminded Æschylus that all soothing is not so guileless as that, and so to have used the epithet, conveying the primary notion of *physical* guilelessness, in something of a distinctive sense. I have sought in my translation to suggest a similar image to the reader, by alluding to Shakespeare's 'flattering unction.'

96. Paley says, "Minime jungas πελάνῳ βασιλείῳ." Why not join them? the sense is perfectly good, "with the royal cake from within,"

and the Greek unexceptionable. Peile's interpretation, given on v. 3, is harsh ("belonging to the palace from within to it"): but he does not mean, as Paley supposes, to take βασιλείῳ as a substantive after μυχόθεν, as if it were for ἐκ μύχων βασιλείου.

99. "τε negligenter additum, quemadmodum εἶτα post participia additur." Dindorf. The fact seems to be that τε is often used, not only after participles, but in other sentences, in a manner not reducible perhaps to any very strict rules, but easily accountable for by those who judge of the dead languages by the living.—It marks an addition; and as it would be difficult to enumerate the circumstances in which the mind makes an addition to a thought previously expressed, so it must be difficult to classify all the cases in which τε occurs. In Choeph. 95. δόσιν τε τῶν κακῶν ἐπαξίαν, τε seems to have the force of καὶ ταῦτα, 'to recompense . . . and that with a gift,' &c. So one may easily understand it being used after a parti-

For to all our city's gods that dwell  
 In the sky or the market, in earth or hell,  
 The altars glow with a blazing show  
 Of the choicest gifts and fairest.  
 Now here, now there, is there soaring high  
 A flame lift up to the lofty sky,  
 Still fed by the oil so pure and clear,  
 With an unction, soothing, yet all sincere,  
 And the cake from the royal palace.  
 Of this, I pray, if thou canst, declare  
 What is right and well for thy tongue to tell,  
 And give me a balm for this saddening care,  
 Which now in the breast breeds dark despair,  
 And now fair Hope, with her bright face seen  
 The diverging flames of the shrine between,

ciple, the mind dwelling on the participle till it seems to occupy the place of a principal verb, and so to require connection with the *verbo* that follows.

101. τότε δ' ἐκ θυσιῶν ἀγανὰ φαίνουσ'. In strict grammatical propriety the relative, ἡ νῦν (μέριμνα), should have been the nominative to the whole of the dependent clauses; but the Chorus, after speaking of it as at one time the parent of evil thoughts, prefers looking on this gloomy phase as the only one connected with it, and attributing the brighter appearances to hope, which consequently becomes a new nominative; just as we are constantly in the habit of coupling with a verb attached to one of the oblique cases of a relative, another which is perfectly independent: e. g. 'I gave him the crown, which he took and went away,' where the last verb, though inserted in the subjoined clause as it were on the faith of preserving a connection with the relative, has in reality nothing to do with it. This seems a better ac-

count of the present passage than Peile's translation, 'assuming the form of soothing hope;' otherwise we might read ἀγανὰ φαίνουσ' Ἐλπίδ', which would have the further advantage of giving an accusative to φαίνουσ'; (and such I find from Paley to be the reading of Dobree, *Adversaria*, II. p. 23). To say with Wunderlich that ἀγανὰ φαίνουσ' can stand for φαίνουσ' ἀγανὰ οὔσα, as that can for φαίνουσ' ἐαυτὴν ἀγανὰ οὔσαν, is simply to assert that φαίνουσα may be put for φαινομένη; but see on v. 1139. Klausen's attempt to recall the MSS. reading φαίνεις, in the shape of his own 'levissima mutatio' φαίνειν, may be judged of by the construction he proposes, τότε δ' ἐκ θυσιῶν ἀγανὰ ἐλπίς ἀμύνει τὴν θυμόβορον φρένα φαίνειν φροντίδ' ἀπληστον λύπης, where even if Æschylus could be supposed capable of so hopelessly involving a plain sentence, he would probably have preferred ἀμύνει μὴ φαίνειν. ἄς ἀναφαίνεις, a conjecture adopted by Franz, is certainly a very slight change; but the words so restored would add nothing to the



ἔλπις ἀμύνει φροντίδ' ἄπληστον,  
τὴν θυμοβόρον φρένα λύπην.

κύριός εἰμι θροεῖν ὄδιον κράτος αἴσιον ἀνδρῶν      στρ.  
ἐκτελέων—ἔτι γὰρ θεόθεν καταπνείει      105  
πειθῶ μολπᾶν  
ἀλκὰν ξύμφυτος αἰὼν—  
ὅπως Ἀχαιῶν  
δίθρονον κράτος, Ἑλλάδος ἦβας  
ξύμφρονα ταγὰν,      110  
πέμπει ξὺν δορὶ καὶ χερὶ πράκτορι  
θούριος ὄρνις Τευκρίδ' ἐπ' αἶαν,  
οἰωνῶν βασιλεὺς, βασιλεῦσι νε-  
ῶν ὁ κελαινὸς ὃ τ' ἔξοπιν ἀργίας  
φανέντες ἵκταρ      115

sense, and it seems scarcely probable that so suitable a word as ἀγανὰ should be entirely due to the misconception or ill-timed ingenuity of a transcriber. Butler's ἀγανὰ σαίνουσ' is very plausible; still I cannot help wishing there were authority for supposing the existence of a word ἀγανοφραίνουσ', standing in the same relation to ἀγανόφρων, ἀγανοφροσύνη as εὐφραίνω to εὐφρων, εὐφροσύνη. φραίνω seems only to have existed in its compounds, or it might be proposed in the place of φαίνω itself.

103. Heath's reading, τὴν θυμόβορον φρένα λύπην, seems on the whole the best, involving a slighter alteration of the text than Hermann's τῆς θυμοβόρου φρένα λύπης. Haupt's objection, that θυμοβόρον, being a compound word, cannot have the privilege allowed of simple verbals, of acting the part of a participle, is a fair specimen of that style of scholarship which in dogmatising about usages forgets the reasons

which lie behind them. θυμοβορεῖν φρένα might undoubtedly be used pleonastically, like νέκταρ ἐφνοχόει in Hom. Il. IV. 3; and if a compound word can be used as a simple one, and simple verbals may be used as the participles of simple verbs, no merely negative evidence can be sufficient to bar the obvious consequence, that compound verbals may have the same function. εὐμαθὲς, in Soph. Trach. 614, according to the common reading as explained by Hermann, is an instance in point.—The ordinary text, or at least the only one of the ancient readings which does not offend against the metre, τὴν θυμόβορον φρένα λύπης, has met with no satisfactory explanation. Klausen's attempt has been given above: Peile's, which connects λύπης with φροντίδ' ἄπληστον, and makes τὴν θ. φ. a second accusative after ἀμύνει, is almost as unnatural; and Haupt's rendering, 'den herznagenden Traumgedanken,' seems to proceed on the notion that φρένα

Beats off from my heart the consuming smart,  
The insatiate vulture's malice.

I am the man! I must be up and telling  
The signs which met the chieftains on their way.  
I am the man—within me yet is swelling,  
From heaven itself, the prompting of the lay,  
The genial strength proportioned to my day—  
How the chiefs of Greece in their twin throned power,  
The united crown of Achæa's flower,  
There sends with spear and avenging hand  
The imperial bird to the Trojan land,  
The king of the fowls to the kings of the fleet—  
One eagle black, one white on the back—

can be taken in apposition with *φροντίδα*; as though a Greek would talk of the *φρὴν* being banished from the mind! The only tolerable way of translating the words would be by looking on the whole clause as a second accusative after *ἀμύνει*, *θυμόβρονον* being followed by *λύπης*,—‘from the mind, soul-devoured by grief.’—Franz has received into the text an entirely new reading, *λύπης θυμοφθόρον ἄτην*, which seems to have been invented for the sole purpose of introducing the word *θυμοφθόρον*, which the best MSS. give. It seems superfluous however to search for any deeper cause of the existence of such a word in the MSS., than the transcribers' ignorance of the metre, which they have made abundantly plain on this very occasion, by their determination in giving *λύπης φρένα* or *λυπόφρενα*. This last fancy the Scholiast in the Farnese MS. defends on metrical grounds; *λυπόφρενα δὲ γράφε' οὕτω γὰρ ἔχει πρὸς τὸ μέτρον ὀρθῶς. δέον δὲ εἰπεῖν καὶ λυπόφρενα, ἀσυνδέτως ἐπέφερεν.*

105. *ἐκτελέων* probably bears the same sense as *ἀνδρὸς τελείου* v. 941,

*τέλεον* v. 1475. It does not appear what is the authority for Dindorf's ‘nobilium,’ however *ἐντελέων* might bear that meaning, nor for the active sense of ‘accomplishers’ or ‘avengers’ assumed by Haupt and Peile.

107. “*ἀλκὰν*, though it stands somewhat nakedly without an epithet, is more easily explained than *αἰὼν* could be, if with Blomf. and Scholef. we were to read *ξύμφυτον*.” Peile; who however should have taken *ἀλκὰν* not as *our* strength, but as the strength of the *αἰὼν* or time of life, as Haupt renders it, ‘*propriam vim suam (quæ tantummodo est loquendi et canendi) ætas*.’ This I have followed in my translation, though it may at first sight appear to have been framed on the reading *ξύμφυτον*. *ξύμφυτος* is to be taken not with *ᾧδιον κράτος*, as Bamberger supposes, but with *ἐμοὶ* or some such word, like *οἱ συγγενεῖς μῆνες*, quoted by Peile from Soph. *Œd. T.* 1082; and *τοῦ ξυνεύδοντος χρόνου* in this very play, v. 863.

114. *ἀργὰς* for *ἀργῆς*, as Liddell and Scott remark sub voce *ἀργίας*,

μελάβρων, χερὸς ἐκ δοριπάλτου,  
 παμπρέπτοις ἐν ἔδραισιν,  
 βοσκόμενοι λαγίναν ἐρικύμονα φέρματι γένναν,  
 βλαβέντα λιοισθίων δρόμων.  
 αἴλινον αἴλινον εἶπε, τὸ δ' εὖ νικάτω.

120

κεδνὸς δὲ στρατόμαντις ἰδὼν δύο λήμασι δισσοὺς ἀντ.  
 Ἀτρείδας μαχίμους ἐδάη λαγοδαίτας  
 πομπούς τ' ἀρχὰς,  
 οὕτω δ' εἶπε τεράζων.  
 Χρόνῳ μὲν ἀγρεῖ 125  
 Πριάμου πόλιν ἄδε κέλευθος,  
 πάντα δὲ πύργων  
 κτήνη πρόσθε τὰ δημοπληθῇ  
 Μοῖρ' ἀλαπάξει πρὸς τὸ βίαιον.  
 οἶον μή τις ἄγα θεόθεν κνεφά- 130  
 σῇ προτυπὲν στόμιον μέγα Τροίας  
 στρατωθέν· οἴκῳ  
 γὰρ ἐπίφθονος Ἀρτεμις ἀγνὰ,

seems better than Blomfield's suggestion of ἀργᾶς for ἀργάεις, which Dindorf approves. Perhaps however the other writers are right in supposing ἀργίας should be pronounced as a dissyllable, as seems to be the case with καρδίαν, καρδίας, Suppl. 71, 799, where Dindorf introduces the form κάρζα. Paley here reads Τρωίας in the antistrophe; but is this consistent with the metre?

117. ἔδρα Peile shews by quotations to have been a technical term of augury.

118. λαγίναν γένναν . . . . βλαβέντα is an instance of that looseness in the use of genders which appears several times in this play, and is not to be accounted for so much on the σχῆμα πρὸς τὸ σηµαίνόμενον prin-

ciple, which would suppose e. g. τιθέντες in v. 544 to refer to δμβροὶ understood in δρόσοι, as by the unfixedness of the language at the time Æschylus wrote,—a fact which may further excuse such anomalies as εἰ προδῶ Eum. 234, the elision of the diphthong in Prom. 837, Sept. 455, &c. λιοισθίων δρόμων has been taken 'from further running,' 'from making the course λοίσθιος;' but it is in all probability an instance of the pleonastic form of expression so common in the tragedians, as in Soph. Œd. Col. 1200, ἀδέρκτων ὀμμάτων τητώμενος, and means 'in respect of the course, so that it proved her last.'

121. δύο λήμασι δισσοὺς seems introduced simply to correct the notion of entire blending which

Appearing near on the hand of the spear  
 In the high-pitched pride of their stately seat :—  
 They twain were devouring a hare and her brood,  
 In the last of her courses borne down and subdued :  
 Sing sorrow ! sing sorrow ! but triumph the good !

Now as the wise host-prophet stood surveying  
 The two bold sons of Atreus, warriors true,  
 The fell devourers of the hare, portraying  
 Those missioned chieftains, all at once he knew,  
 And thus told out the signs that crossed his view :  
 This journey of ours shall at length come down  
 In spoiler-wise upon Priam's town,  
 And the wealth of the people, the bulwarks' store,  
 Shall Fate in her fury devour before.  
 Let but no grudge from the gods above  
 Cast envious night on the curb so bright,  
 For the queen of the chase abhors the race,

might have arisen from the two Atridæ having been spoken of as one in vv. 41 sq. 109 sq., consistently with what was then the purpose of the poet, just as the two eagles first appear in v. 112 as *θούριος ὄρνις*, when the notion of an omen generally corresponding to the commanding power of the expedition was all that was required, and the further parallel between the number of the eagles and that of the generals was still undeveloped.

122. *λαγυδαίτας πομπούς τ' ἀρχάς*. He put the two facts of the devourers of the hare and the missioned chieftains together in his mind, and knew them both ; the inference being, that he knew the one to represent the other.

138. *οἶον*, as equivalent to *μόνον*, is so exactly the word wanted in this passage, that I have not hesitated to adopt it in place of *οἶον*, in spite of the objection that it wants

authority. When we know that *οἶος* means the same as *μόνος*, and that *μόνον* is convertible with our *only*, it is merely idle to argue that *οἶον* cannot mean *only* in the sense of *provided that*, because we have no instance within call wherein it so occurs. *οἶος* itself does not often occur in the Attic writers in any shape, so that the chance of meeting with a particular form of it, even supposing there to be no question *a priori* of the legitimacy of that form, is naturally very small. Besides, the Scholiast, whose authority, if good for nothing else, is a respectable one on points of usage, renders *οἶον* here by *μόνον*.

133. For *οἶκῳ*, which is not at first sight very intelligible, Bothe proposes to read *οἶκοι, privatim, secum*. *οἶω* might also be suggested in the same parenthetical sense which it bears in Prom. 187, though there the editors wish to treat it as an

πτανοῖσιν κυσὶ πατρὸς,  
αὐτότοκον πρὸ λόχου μογεράν πτάκα θυομένοισι·  
στυγεί δὲ δεῖπνον αἰετῶν.  
αἴλινον αἴλινον εἶπέ, τὸ δ' εὖ νικάτω.

135

τόσσον περ εὖφρων ἅ καλὰ  
δρόσοισι λεπτοῖς μαλερῶν λεόντων,  
πάντων τ' ἄγρονόμων φιλομάστοις  
θηρῶν ὀβρικόλοισι τερπνὰ,  
τούτων αἰτεῖ ξύμβολα κράναι,  
δεξιὰ μὲν, κατάμομφα δὲ φάσματα [στρούθων].

140

interpolation. Klausen's explanation of οἶκος is however tolerably satisfactory: 'Domus constat ex Atridis: Atridæ aquilis significantur: si Atridis irata est Diana, est etiam aquilis: si his, illis;' except that perhaps it should rather be rendered 'to the whole race' of devourers, whether men or brutes. It is strange however that Klausen, whom one would have supposed from that note to have seen that the hatred of Diana to the Atridæ was only a necessary consequence of her hatred to the eagles, should have sought further to account for it by bringing up the story of Agamemnon having killed a doe—a story, as Hermann and Bamberger observe, which is found indeed in Sophocles, but which Æschylus seems to have known nothing about. As if the stress of the omen lay in this parallel, and not in the resemblance between the destroyers of Troy and the destroyers of the hare! The very omen shews that something prophetic was intended—an allusion to the future, not to the past; and so Calchas understands it; beginning at once χρόνῳ μὲν ἀγρεῖ, as in Homer, Il. II. 311, he foretels the destruction of Troy from the destruction of the

sparrows. Diana had a reason for protecting the hare: but the hare in the language of symbolism meant Troy; hence she hated the future destroyers of Troy. 'Causa satis futilis,' says Schutz; and so it may appear to us: but so it would not appear to men who took Æschylus' view of things. Typology with them meant something: it implied no fanciful resemblance, but a real connection; and by virtue of that connection the antitype had all the liabilities of the type made over to it, and might be treated as the type.

138. τόσσον περ εὖφρων. It is from a love for the forest-beasts that Diana begs from a ratification of the omen, not from a love for us, so that we may expect something bad as well as good, and had better deprecate it.

139. λεπταῖς was long since proposed by Blomfield, who himself preferred ἀλέπτοις, *ovo nondum exchysis*. Wellauer however has generally had the credit of restoring λεπτοῖς, though Hermann and Ahrens have both been named as its authors. If we adopt it, as there seems good reason for doing, it will be another case of the uncertainty of Æschylus' genders, noticed on v. 118. In words of a masculine termination

The winged hounds of her father Jove:—  
 For they ate a tame creature all quick with its brood:  
 The eagles she hates, and their banquet of blood:  
 Sing sorrow! sing sorrow! but triumph the good!

From such a heart of kindly love  
 For dew-drop gems of mighty lions  
 And all the tender nursling scions  
 Of beasts that in the forest rove,  
 Prays she for a quick decision  
 Of this mysterious flight, this fair yet chequered vision.

especially it is probable that the gender should not have been regarded as a fixed thing so early as those who make no allowance for the changes of a language would suppose. *πῶλος* is generally considered a feminine noun, yet its plural occurs in Soph. Electr. 725, 6, with *τελοῦντες* after it—*πρὸς τὸ σημαυνόμενον*, they say, for *ἵπποι*! Socrates, in Aristoph. Clouds, 670, etc., is made to ridicule the anomaly of saying *ἡ κάρδοπος* instead of *ἡ καρδόπη*; a piece of purism, doubtless, as intended by Aristoph., but still shewing that the inconsistency was felt. —*ἀέλπτοις* might possibly stand, like Bothe's *ἀάπτοις*, the savageness of the lions being transferred to the cubs, were not *λεπτοῖς* so much more probable intrinsically: *ἀέλπτοις* scarcely could in any case. The two interpretations of the Scholiast, *τοῖς ἔπεσθαι τοῖς γονεῦσι μὴ δυναμένοις*. *ἄλλως τοῖς μὴ δυναμένοις πτῆναι*, are about equally valuable.

141. *τερπνὰ* is better taken with Klausen and Peile after the Schol. on the Farn. MS. as agreeing with Artemis than with others as an epithet of *ξύμβολα*, the ratification of the symbols as asked by Diana being in their character of *κατάμομφα*, not in that of *δεξιά*.

143. The metrical objection to

the common reading of this line might be obviated by substituting *φάσμα* for *φάσματα* with Lachmann; but the word *στρουθῶν* seems utterly indefensible, whether we take it with Peile of birds generally, or with others of eagles in particular. Peile makes an ingenious attempt to convert the argument against the genuineness of the word, the probability that it should have been introduced by a transcriber from the passage in Il. II., into a reason for retaining it, on the ground that Æschylus himself may have wished to make such an allusion,—that is, that Æschylus, having determined to follow a different story, chose to mis-call the name of the birds in order to remind his audience of Homer,—and this, when the eagles and sparrows mean two totally different things, the one the Atridæ, the other, the years of the siege of Troy, which the Greeks, represented by the serpent, were supposed to consume. Hermann, who, understanding *στρουθῶν* in its natural sense, believes Æschylus in this place to be speaking only of the genuine Homeric vision of the sparrows as a *second* omen which required fulfilment, informs me that in one of the ancient vases given in Böttiger's work both *φάσματα* are represented:

Ἰήϊον δὲ καλέω Παιᾶνα,  
 μή τινας ἀντιπνόους Δαναοῖς χρονίας ἐχενῆδας 145  
 ἀπλοίας τεύξῃ,  
 σπευδομένα θυσίαν ἐτέραν, ἄνομόν τιν', ἄδαιτον,  
 νεικέων τέκτονα σύμφυτον, οὐ δεισήνορα· μίμνει  
 γὰρ φοβερά παλίνορτος  
 οἰκονόμος δολία, μνάμων μῆνις τεκνόποινος. 150  
 τοιάδε Κάλχας ξὺν μεγάλοις ἀγαθοῖς ἀπέκλαγξεν  
 μόρσιμ' ἀπ' ὀρνίθων ὀδίων οἴκοις βασιλείοις·  
 τοῖς δ' ὁμόφωνον  
 αἴλινον αἴλινον εἶπέ, τὸ δ' εὖ νικάτω.

Ζεὺς, ὅστις ποτ' ἐστίν, εἰ τόδ' αὖ- στρ. α'.  
 τῷ φίλον κεκλημένῳ, 156  
 τοῦτό νιν προσεννέπω.  
 οὐκ ἔχω προσεικάσαι,  
 πάντ' ἐπισταθμώμενος,  
 πλὴν Διὸς, εἰ τὸ μάταν ἀπὸ φροντίδος ἄχθος 160  
 χρὴ βαλεῖν ἐτητύμως.  
 οὐδ' ὅστις πάροιθεν ἦν μέγας, ἀντ. α'.  
 παμμάχῳ θράσει βρύων,  
 οὐδὲν [ἂν] λέξαι, πρὶν ὧν·

but it seems more probable that the artist should have taken the two, one from Homer and one from Æschylus, than that the poet should have given the one at full length and made an obscure allusion to the other. Dindorf supposes a lacuna; Franz goes further, filling it up with the word ἀητῶν.

155. The Chorus has been repeating the words of Calchas, and joining in the prayer to Apollo therein expressed. The φάσματα are δεξιὰ μὲν, κατάμομφα δέ; the burden of the whole is αἴλινον, αἴλινον εἶπέ, τὸ δ' εὖ νικάτω; they feel there are

clouds in the distance, though they cannot see them. They begin to address Zeus, hoping that he may cheer them. It is natural that he should alone have the power, for all the former gods are nothing to him, while he is almighty.—Taking this view of the connection of thought, we shall not need to suppose with Blomfield that the sentence οὐκ ἔχω προσεικάσαι κ. τ. λ. refers to the doubt whether Ζεὺς is the proper name to use, or to inquire whether in that case the subject of προσεικάσαι is εἰ τὸ μάταν κ. τ. λ., or, as Blomf. seems to think, ἄλλο τι



But I—to Pæan I would call,  
 Lest for the Danaans she create  
 Fell storms, to keep the fleet in tedious thrall,  
 Hastening another deed—a deed all law disclaiming,  
 A feast which none may eat—source of domestic hate,  
 By husband's rights unawed: for there is flaming  
 Vengeance for offspring slain, a warder stern  
 Guarding with treasured guile the house for *his* return.  
 Such ills and such blessings the seer as he stood  
 From the birds on the way to the monarchs portended:  
 And in unison blended  
 Sing sorrow! sing sorrow! but triumph the good!

Zeus, whoe'er he is, if such the name  
 Suits his royal pleasure well,  
 Thus would I his style proclaim—  
 Else in sooth I cannot tell,  
 Weighing every power I know,  
 Save Zeus alone, if I indeed may throw  
 From my breast this causeless woe.—  
 He who ruled the subject world before  
 Blossoming in strength's array,  
 Speechless lies, a thing of yore:

understood, 'any other name than that of Zeus.'

164. οὐδὲ λέγεται, the conjecture of Ahrens, preserves the pure trochaic metre better than any of the alterations which have been proposed for the corrupt readings of the MSS. οὐδὲν τι λέξαι, οὐδὲν λέξαι. Perhaps however οὐδὲν ἄξεται, which will only involve a supposed confusion of ΛΕΞΑΙ and ΑΞΕΤΑΙ, may be better, in the sense of *nihili pendetur*, οὐδὲν being equivalent to οὐδένοσ, παρ' οὐδὲν, or ἐν οὐδεμίᾳ μοίρᾳ, the phrase used by Hdt. I. 134, etc., like οὐδὲν ἄξία, Choeph. 439. The omission of -ται, and its subsequent

insertion in a wrong place, may account for the reading οὐδὲν τι λέξαι. (This gives us a better derivation for ἄξιος than that proposed by Liddell and Scott from ἄγω in the sense of *weighing* (ἄξιος, *drawing down* so much weight, or weighing so much), according to which it would be difficult to account for its taking a genitive, whereas now we see the genitive to be one of those which are commonly called genitives of price, but which are really only forms of the genitive of relation. Thus ἄξιος will exactly mean *estimable*.) Meantime I have followed the reading λέξαι in my translation.



ὅς δ' ἔπειτ' ἔφυ, τριακ-  
τῆρος οἶχεται τυχών.

165

Ζῆνα δέ τις προφρόνως ἐπινίκια κλάζων,  
τεύξεται φρενῶν τὸ πᾶν.

τὸν φρονεῖν βροτοὺς ὁδώ-  
σαντα, τῷ πάθει μάθος  
θέντα κυρίως ἔχειν.

στρ. β'.

170

στάζει δ' ἔν θ' ὕπνῳ πρὸ καρδίας  
μνησιπήμων πόνος, καὶ παρ' ἄ-  
κοντας ἦλθε σωφρονεῖν.

δαιμόνων δέ που χάρις βίαιος  
σέλμα σεμνὸν ἡμένων.

175

καὶ τόθ' ἡγέμων ὁ πρέσ-  
βυς νεῶν Ἀχαϊκῶν,  
μάντιν οὔτινα ψέγων,

ἀντ. β'.

ἐμπαίοις τύχαισι συμπνέων,

180

167. Ζῆνα δέ. Blomfield, in attacking Schutz's interpretation of this and the following line, which renders ἐπινίκια κλάζων 'entreating Zeus by song for victory,' falls himself into the error of supposing τεύξεται φρενῶν τὸ πᾶν to mean no more than 'omnino recte judicat;' and with this subsequent editors seem to agree. What follows however plainly shews the poet to mean not the wisdom *shewn in* so addressing Zeus, but that which is gained *in consequence of* it, and as a *reward for* it. The development of this thought, that Zeus is the author of wisdom, into a meditation of the chief way in which wisdom comes, occupies the succeeding strophe.

170. τῷ πάθει. Porson, Schutz, and Blomfield read τὸν, but the omission of the article before θέντα, as Wellauer remarks, shews θέντα to be closely connected with ὁδώσαντα,

as specifying the *means* by which the thing described before is done. So v. 352. τὸν τάδε πράξαντ' ἐπ' Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τείνοντα πάλαι τόξον, and Prom. 947. τὸν ἐξαμαρτόντ' εἰς θεοὺς ἐφημέροισι πορόντα τιμὰς, where the MSS. give τὸν before ἐφημέροισι, to the injury of the metre,—evidently the insertion of some one who did not understand the construction.

175. βίαιος is clearly required by what goes before, παρ' ἄκοντας ἦλθε σωφρονεῖν. που would have but little force were the meaning of the sentence merely—'this σωφρονεῖν is the gift of the gods who sit on high;' as it is, it gives just that air of doubt to the sentence which is natural: 'strange as it may seem, the free gift of the gods is forced on men.' Add to this, that βιαίως could scarcely be construed with ἡμένων, signifying as it does not mere power or strength, but absolute violence.

And the next has passed away,  
Thrice o'erthrown upon the plain :—  
But he who swells to Zeus the triumph-strain,  
All of wisdom shall obtain,—

Zeus, who doth to wisdom guide  
Mortals,—who hath firmly tied  
Love to suffering, there to bide.  
Thus in deep sleep before the heart distill  
Cold sweat-drops, wrung from thought of former ill,  
And Prudence comes on men against their will.  
Such gifts the gods shower down in man's despite  
From their glorious thrones of light.  
So the chief of Grecia's train  
Eldest-born, in nothing fain  
Of the prophet to complain,  
Timing his breath to meet the tempest's sway,

This Wellauer and Butler (*curæ secundæ*) slur over in their rendering *potenter* insidentium: *violenter*, the proper word, would have jarred on the ear at once. It may be answered that *ἡμενος βιαίως* means 'enthroned by violence,' the violence being confined merely to the circumstances of the enthronement; but the accusative *σέλμα* shews that the notion of *having been placed*, which could never act the part of a transitive verb, has passed into that of *sitting*, and that *ἡμένων* is used precisely as *θασσόντων* might be.

179. *μάντιν οὐτινα ψέγων. τις* generalizes (as in v. 55. *ἢ τις Ἀπόλλων*), and thereby strengthens the negation, "not only did he not reproach Calchas, but he said nothing against any of his order," unlike Creon in Soph. Ant. 1055. *τὸ μαντικόν τοι πᾶν φιλάργυρον γένος*, and Achilles in Eur. Iph. Aul. 956. *τίς δὲ μάντις ἔστ' ἀνὴρ, ὅς ὀλίγ' ἀληθῆ, πολλὰ δὲ ψευδῆ λέγει Τυχῶν, ὅταν δὲ μὴ τύχη, διοίχεται;*

—contrary indeed to what he is himself represented as doing in the latter play, v. 520 (if the passage be genuine), *τὸ μαντικὸν πᾶν σπέρμα φιλότιμον κακόν*. Our English *no* is used in the same way for *not* in such expressions as *No popery*.

180. Sewell understands *συμπνέων* to mean 'breathing in time,' so as to hold his breath during the infliction of the blow, and thus escape part of the pain; an ingenious thought, which was before my mind when I used the word 'timing' in my translation, though I believe Æschylus merely to mean the tempest of fate by *ἔμπαισι τύχαι*, and the acquiescence of Agamemnon (in metaphorical language, his breathing along with the blast) by *συμπνέων*. Compare afterwards v. 210. *φρενὸς πνέων δυσσεβῆ τροπαίαν*, where, by the bye, we must either say that Æschylus is speaking of the same state of mind as here, since Agamemnon then was only consenting to the *ἔμπαισι τύχαι*,—



When in the exhaustion of windbound delay  
The Achæan host were wasting fast away,  
Compelled in front of Chalcis' shores to wait  
All in Aulis' reflux strait,

And breezes from Strymon southward sweeping  
In the holiday of famine ever keeping  
Men in harbour, yet leading them astray,  
Of vessels and cableropes unsparing,  
The flower of Greece were gradually wearing,  
Stretching time back a weary, weary way:—  
When for the wild wind's blowing  
A cure yet more severe,  
The charge on Dian throwing,  
Pealed forth at length the seer,  
Till the Atridæ sunk in grief profound,  
Smiting with their sceptres on the ground,  
Could no longer check the tear,  
'Twas then the elder chief began his saying—

men in harbour, yet leading them astray'—making their minds wander by the vacancy of inaction, such as is felt in its most dreadful form in solitary confinement. Specific reference may be made to Tennyson's *Mariana*, as one of the most powerful delineations of what the feeling really is.

188. Peile's translation of *παλιμμήκη*, 'twice as long as they ought to have been,' is rather prosaic, especially here. The notion seems to be that of a line which, as often as they seemed to be approaching the end of it, was continually doubling back again—a repeated *διανολος*. He is clearly right however in his general conception of *τρίβω*. When a word in a passage like this has evidently some connection with *wearing*, it is a mere throwing of it away to explain the wearing as that

of a beaten path, the road which they had worn in their journey, as Blomfield seems inclined to take it, unless either *τρίβω* can be taken in the sense of *τριβῆ*, or *τριβῆ* itself introduced into the text. Here and in v. 380, *τρίβω τε καὶ προσβολαῖς*, the word may safely be rendered 'attrition,' whence the meaning 'way' is obviously derived. The harmony of the verse too is better preserved by taking *τρίβω* with what follows. Klausen has *τρίβω* right, but refers it to the preceding clause, 'prælongum tempus attritioni locantes.' But it is not the wearing which is long and tedious, but the length and tediousness of their stay which constitutes the wearing. *τρίβω* might be taken in an *ablative* sense after *τιθείσαι*, were not the construction with *κατέξαινον* more satisfactory.

βαρεῖα δ', εἰ τέκνον δαΐξω, δόμων ἄγαλμα,  
 μαιίνων παρθενοσφάγοισιν  
 ῥεῖθροις πατρώους χέρας βωμοῦ πέλας.

200

τί τῶνδ' ἄνευ κακῶν ;  
 πῶς λιπόνανς γένωμαι,  
 ξυμμαχίας ἁμαρτῶν ;  
 παυσανέμου γὰρ θυσίας  
 παρθενίου θ' αἵματος ὀρ-  
 γᾶ περιόργως ἐπιθυ-  
 μεῖν θέμις· εὖ γὰρ εἶη.

205

ἐπεὶ δ' ἀνάγκας ἔδν λέπαδνον,  
 φρενὸς πνέων δυσσεβῇ τροπαίαν  
 ἄναγνον, ἀνίερον, τόθεν  
 τὸ παντότολμον φρονεῖν μετέγνω.  
 βροτοὺς θρασύνει γὰρ αἰσχρομήτις  
 τάλαινα παρακοπὰ πρωτοπήμων.

στρ. δ'.

210

ἔτλα δ' οὖν θυτὴρ γενέσθαι θυγατρὸς,

215

208. θέμις· εὖ γὰρ εἶη. I have bitter irony, after Symmons, who sometimes wished to read εὖ γ' ἂν has translated the whole of the εἶη, understanding the passage from speech very powerfully :  
 παυσανέμου downwards as a burst of

O heavy, fatal doom ! to disobey !  
 O heavy, fatal doom ! my child to slay,  
 My child, the idol treasure of my house !  
 Must I, her father, all bedabbled o'er  
 In streaming rivers of her virgin gore,  
 Stand by the altar with polluted hands ?  
 O woe ! woe ! woe !

Where shall I turn me ? How forego  
 The kings, the ships, the leagued chieftain bands ?  
*They're not her parents ;* they may call aloud  
 For the dire rite to smooth the stormy flood,  
 All fierce and thirsty for a virgin's blood.

The common reading and interpretation however suits better with the spirit attributed to Agamemnon in vv. 179, 180, expressing as it does his ultimate resignation, together with a vague prayer that this frightful sacrifice may be for the best.

212. Haupt rightly renders μετέγνω 'mutato animo decrevit,' which of course takes φρονεῖν τὸ παντότολμον as an accusative after it ; but he is wrong in connecting βροτοῖς with the sentence, 'invitâ antistrophâ' as he confesses himself, and translating

"Oh! hard is the fate of disobeying,  
 And hard too, if I must slay my own,  
 The pride of my house, my dearest daughter,  
 Polluting with streams of virgin slaughter  
 A father's hands beside the altar-stone!—  
 What choice has not its anguish?  
 O how shall I forsake  
 The hosts that daily languish,  
 Our formed alliance break?  
 Yes, 'tis just their rage should crave the spell  
 Of a virgin's blood the storm to quell—  
 Well—my blessing let them take!"  
 But when he the yoke of force put on,  
 Breathing forth change of spirit, as a wind,  
 Unrighteous, unholy, he was won  
 At once to all recklessness of mind—  
 For that counsellor of ill,  
 That wretched, desperate self-deceit

'ad quodlibet audendum in mortali-  
 bus promptus exstiterit.' Blomfield,  
 who is wrong in supposing the con-  
 struction to be τὸ παντότολμον μετέγνω  
 (τὸ) φρονεῖν, is surely right in read-  
 ing with Musgrave and Hermann  
 βροτοῦς θρασύνει. It is easy enough  
 to translate with Klausen 'in mor-  
 talibus fiduciam procreat insania,' as  
 it would be to say in English 'infa-  
 tuation acts as an emboldening prin-  
 ciple among men;' but in strict  
 grammatical propriety θρασύνει is  
 not exactly equal to either the one  
 or the other, and the difficulty  
 ought to have been fairly met by  
 proposing as a Latin or an English  
 version 'audacia armat in mortali-  
 bus,' or 'emboldens among men.'  
 Peile, who fancies that βροτοῦς would  
 be universal, βροτοῖς only general,  
 has collected a number of instances  
 where the dative is used; in all of  
 them however the verb is either

neuter, or, if transitive, has an ob-

ject already provided, in which cases  
 of course no one would doubt the  
 use of a dative.  
 214. Of Blomfield's two interpre-  
 tations of πρωτοπήμων, 'primus ma-  
 lorum fons' and 'insania quæ a pri-  
 ma calamitate oritur,' like καινοπήμων  
 in Sept. 358, I have preferred the  
 latter. In the poet's mind, utter  
 recklessness doubtless appeared as  
 the parent of crime, but it also ap-  
 peared as itself arising from crime  
 or misfortune (the circumstances  
 which provoked the wrath of Diana,  
 and reduced Agamemnon to this  
 strait, to wit, his foreseen character  
 as a destroyer, partaking, as it would  
 be thought, of the nature of both);  
 and as the prospective view has al-  
 ready been expressed by αἰσχρομήτης,  
 and indeed by the verb θρασύνει, as  
 well as by τὸ παντότολμον preceding,  
 it seems natural to make πρωτοπήμων  
 retrospective, and thus complete the  
 moral.

γυναικοποιῶν πολέμων ἄρωγαν,  
καὶ προτέλεια ναῶν.

λιτὰς δὲ καὶ κληδόνας πατρώους  
παρ' οὐδέν, αἰῶνα παρθένοιόν τ',  
ἔθεντο φιλόμαχοι βραβεῖς.

ἀντ. δ.

220

φράσεν δ' αὐτοῖς πατήρ μετ' εὐχάν,  
δίκαν χιμαίρας ὑπερθε βωμοῦ  
πέπλοισι περιπετῇ παντὶ θυμῷ  
προνωπῇ λαβεῖν ἀέρδην, στόματός  
τε καλλιπρώρου φυλακὰν κατασχεῖν

225

φθόγγον ἀραίον οἴκοις,  
βία χαλίνων τ' ἀναύδῳ μένει.  
κρόκου βαφὰς δ' ἐς πέδον χέουσα,  
ἔβαλλ' ἕκαστον θυτήρων

στρ. ε.

230

ἀπ' ὀμματος βέλει φιλοίκτῳ,  
πρέπουσά θ' ὡς ἐν γραφαῖς, προσεννέπειν  
θέλουσ'· ἐπεὶ πολλάκις  
πατρὸς κατ' ἀνδρῶνας εὐτραπέζους

216. “ ἄρωγαν. *Quæ res esset auxilio. Eadem constructio . . . .* Cho. 192, Eur. Hel. 77. ἀπόλαυσιν εἰκοῦς ἔθανες ἄν. Plura Monk ad Alcest. 7.” Paley.

224. Whether παντὶ θυμῷ refers to the mental as well as bodily prostration of Iphigenia (as I have translated it), or to the resolution of those who were to lay hold of her, may be doubted. The position of the words between περιπετῇ and προνωπῇ makes for the former: the passages where they occur, quoted by Blomfield, for the latter.

225. It seems necessary with Blomfield to understand κατασχεῖν in two different and connected senses, κατασχεῖν φυλακὰν and κατασχεῖν φθόγγον.—Klausen cannot be right in making φυλακὰν the accusative of the subject, φθόγγον of the object.

Peile's method of regarding φυλακὰν κατασχεῖν as a cognate accusative is better, but still harsh. Dindorf says ‘ φθόγγον accusativus absolutus, ut v. 226 (216):’ but the case of ἄρωγαν is by no means parallel. Boyd, in his prose translation of the Agamemnon, ingeniously cuts the knot by understanding φυλακὴ στόματος of the *lips*, ‘the guard of the mouth,’ a sense which he likewise affixes to ἔρκος ὀδόντων in Homer; but in neither case does the suggestion carry sufficient conviction with it to overturn the general consent in favour of the ordinary version.

228. My version, ‘as she shed to earth her saffron shower,’ may seem to leave the question undecided, whether we are to take κρόκου βαφὰς χέουσα as dropping her veil or gar-

The unconscious madness of an erring will,  
 Springing from early sin unpardoned,  
 The mortal heart full oft has hardened.  
 So then he had the heart to kill  
 That young and lovely one,  
 To speed a war in woman's cause begun,  
 And take the charm from off the fleet,  
 Her prayers and her 'father'-calling cries,—  
 The spring of her tender virgin life—  
 All these seemed as nothing in their eyes,  
 Stern judges, hot thirsting for the strife.  
 When at length the prayer was done,  
 The father gave the priests command,  
 As 'twere some kid's above the altar-stone  
 To lift her form from where they found her,  
 Fallen, with her robes all streaming round her,  
 Body and soul alike o'erthrown,  
 And bear her raisingly,  
 Binding those beauteous lips, whose bitter cry  
 The house of Atreus else had banned,  
 With cruel thongs' speech-stifling power.  
 There as she shed to earth her saffron shower,  
 Her glancing eyes' too tender dart  
 Struck pity to each slayer's heart:  
 She stood as in a painting, calm and meek,  
 As though in act to speak,  
 For oft aforetime had she raised the lay

ments, as the case may be, or pouring forth her blood. Klausen, who adopts the latter, urges particularly the appropriateness of the words βαφαῖς and χέουσα to bloodshedding, contending that they cannot properly be used of dropping stained clothing; but he admits that Iphigenia was scarcely likely to give a glance round on the sacrificers, and seem as though in act to speak, after 'the sharp knife' had been

'drawn through her tender throat,' which seems a fatal objection. Æschylus evidently felt with Tennyson that 'nothing more' was then to come; indeed he clearly means to draw the veil before the words τὰ δ' ἔνθεν οὐτ' εἶδον οὐτ' ἐννέπω, like a true Timanthes. Besides κρόκου βαφαῖ can only mean blood under particular circumstances, as will appear on v. 1086.



ἔμελψεν, ἀγνὰ δ' ἀταύρωτος αὐδᾶ πατρὸς  
 φίλου τριτόσπονδον εὐποτμον 235  
 αἰῶνα φίλως ἐτίμα.  
 τὰ δ' ἔνθεν οὔτ' εἶδον, οὔτ' ἐννέπω. ἀντ. ε'.  
 τέχναι δὲ Κάλχαντος οὐκ ἄκραντοι.  
 δίκαι δὲ τοῖς μὲν παθοῦσιν  
 μαθεῖν ἐπιρρέπει τὸ μέλλον, 240  
 τὸ προκλύειν δ' ἢ λύσις προχαιρέτω.  
 ἴσον δὲ τῷ προστένειν.  
 τορὸν γὰρ ἥξει σύνορθρον αὐγαῖς.  
 πέλοιτο δ' οὖν τὰπὶ τούτοιςιν εὐπραξίς, ὥς  
 θέλει τόδ' ἄγχιστον Ἀπίας 245  
 γαίας μονόφρουρον ἔρκος.

ἥκω σεβίζων σὸν, Κλυταιμνήστρα, κράτος·  
 δίκη γάρ ἐστι φωτὸς ἀρχηγοῦ τίειν  
 γυναῖκ', ἐρημωθέντος ἄρσενος θρόνου.  
 σὺ δ' εἴτε κεδνὸν, εἴτε μὴ, πεπυσμένη 250  
 εὐαγγέλοισιν ἐλπίσιν θυηπολεῖς,  
 κλύοιμ' ἂν εὐφρων· οὐδὲ σιγῶσῃ φθόνος.

### ΚΛΥΤΑΙΜΝΗΣΤΡΑ.

εὐάγγελος μὲν, ὥσπερ ἡ παροιμία,  
 ἕως γένοιτο μητρὸς εὐφρόνης πάρα.

239. Δίκαι δὲ τοῖς μὲν παθοῦσιν μαθεῖν ἐπιρρέπει τὸ μέλλον, whether we suppose ἐπιρρέπει to be active or neuter, or construe μαθεῖν before or after τὸ μέλλον, may at any rate be cleared from Linwood's objection that it is harsh to understand τὸ μέλλον, that which *before* was future. The thing spoken of is the future in its strictest sense, and the meaning is that the experience of suffering teaches men the future from the past. In the next line I prefer

Bothe's reading τὸ προκλύειν [δ'] ἢ λύσις (rather ἢ λύσις, 'in what way the knot will be solved') to any that have been proposed, accounting as it does for the insertion of the words ἐπιγένοιτ' ἂν, which were probably thought necessary to complete the sense after λύσις.

243. σύνορθρον αὐγαῖς, the joint emendation of Wellauer and Hermann, can scarcely admit of a question. 'Neoterica est imago istiusmodi,' objects Butler in his curæ

Amidst her sire's gay halls, and purely chaste  
 The glad carousals of the festive day  
 With love's sweet singing graced.  
 The rest I saw not, nor explain ;  
 But Calchas' words shall ne'er return in vain.  
 Suffering may earn the power to see  
 The story of the things to be.  
 But wherefore seek such lore? 'tis but to mourn  
 O'er evils yet unborn—  
 At length 'twill come, clear dawning as the day—  
 For us, O blest henceforward be our fate,  
 True to the wish of this, the one sole stay  
 Of Apia's widowed state.

In homage, Clytæmnestra, to thy power,  
 Behold me here: for meet it is to honour  
 Our ruler's queen, now that his chair is void,  
 But thou—whate'er of tidings, good or ill,  
 Hath prompted thee as now, with flattering hope  
 To light thine altars, fain would I be told:  
 Yet, if thou wilt not speak, I grudge it not.

### CLYTÆMNESTRA.

With happiest tidings, as the proverb says,  
 Fair rise the morning from its mother night!

secundæ: but the opening of Cassandra's speech in v. 1145 is precisely parallel.

245. The form of the expression, *ὡς θέλει* containing an assurance which men would most naturally use of themselves, and *μονόφρουρον ἔρκος* being too strong for the authority we may suppose Clytæmnestra, to have exercised, seems to shew the Chorus itself, not Clytæmnestra, to be meant. Blomfield well compares the opening lines of the *Persæ*, where the Chorus speaks of itself in much the same way, though Atossa acts the part of queen.

249. *ἄρσενος* may either be the epithet of *θρόνου*, or the substantive after *θρόνου* or *ἐρημωθέντος*; but the former seems the more poetical.

251. Peile supposes this line to refer only to the latter hypothesis, *εἴτε μὴ πεπυσμένη*; but there is no occasion for this. Whether Clytæmnestra had heard any thing or not, she might still be spoken of as sacrificing *εὐαγγέλοις ἐλπίσιν*, as nothing short of the arrival of the army itself was likely to be sufficiently unequivocal to remove the matter from the province of hope into that of absolute certainty.

- πεύσει δὲ χάρμα μείζον ἐλπίδος κλύειν. 255  
 Πριάμου γὰρ ἡρήκασιν Ἀργεῖοι πόλιν.  
 ΧΟ. πῶς φής; πέφευγε τοῦπος ἐξ ἀπιστίας.  
 ΚΛ. Τροίαν Ἀχαιῶν οὔσαν· ἢ τορῶς λέγω;  
 ΧΟ. χαρά μ' ὑφέρπει, δάκρυον ἐκκαλουμένη.  
 ΚΛ. εὖ γὰρ φρονούντος ὄμμα σου κατηγορεῖ. 260  
 ΧΟ. τί γάρ; τὸ πιστόν ἐστι τῶνδ' εἰ σοι τέκμαρ;  
 ΚΛ. ἔστιν· τί δ' οὐχί; μὴ δολώσαντος θεοῦ.  
 ΧΟ. πότερα δ' ὀνείρων φάσματ' εὐπειθῇ σέβεις;  
 ΚΛ. οὐ δόξαν ἂν λάβοιμι βριζούσης φρενός.  
 ΧΟ. ἀλλ' ἢ σ' ἐπ' ἰάνεν τις ἄπτερος φάτις; 265  
 ΚΛ. παιδὸς νέας ὥς, κάρτ' ἐμωμήσω φρένας.  
 ΧΟ. ποίου χρόνου δὲ καὶ πεπόρθηται πόλις;  
 ΚΛ. τῆς νῦν τεκούσης φῶς τόδ' εὐφρόνης λέγω.  
 ΧΟ. καὶ τίς τόδ' ἐξίκοιτ' ἂν ἀγγέλων τάχος;  
 ΚΛ. Ἥφαιστος, Ἴδης λαμπρὸν ἐκπέμπων σέλας. 270

255. κλύειν does not depend on ἐλπίδος, as Klausen and Peile think, but is added at the end of the sentence, like τέτρωται δικτύου πλέω λέγειν in v. 837. Soph. Trach. 673. θαῦμ' ἀνέλπιστον μαθεῖν.

257. In spite of my translation, which merely gives the general import of the text, πέφευγεν ἐξ ἀπιστίας means not 'escaped my unbelief,' but 'escaped by reason of my unbelief,' like ἐξ ἀβουλίας πεσεῖν in Soph. Electr. 398.

261. τί γάρ τὸ πιστόν. "Ex responso apparet Chorum interrogasse Clytæmnestram num haberet certius indicium; non interrogavit autem, quale hoc esset." Haupt; with whom I therefore agree in following Schutz, and breaking up the line into two interrogatives. The next line may indeed be an answer to the question as it is usually given, but it forms a far more natural rejoinder to it as it stands according to this punctuation. Blomfield objects 'τί γάρ; sic posi-

tum, significat nam qui fieri potest? vel quis enim neget?" It occurs however in Eum. 211, 678 (quoted by Peile on v. 1104), in the sense which it will bear here, starting an objection or doubt to be resolved, 'but what will you say to this?'

264. I had originally translated this line "I take no credit for a drowsy soul," a sense which it might very well bear, δόξαν λαμβάνειν being used like δόξαν φέρεσθαι, Thuc. II. 11, and the genitive being constructed with δόξα as in Eur. Herc. F. 157. Still on the whole Klausen and Linwood's interpretation seems more natural. βριζούσης φρενός may then be taken either with δόξαν, or, as I have rendered it, with λάβοιμι.

265. ἄπτερος φάτις is another of those phrases which it seems impossible, after all the efforts of critics, to explain satisfactorily. It has been generally the custom to understand it of *swiftness*; but then comes the

Now thou shalt hear of joy beyond all hope:

For know, the Greeks have taken Priam's town.

CHO. How sayest? the word passed from the incredulous ear.

CLY. Troy is the Achæans' prize—now speak I plainly?

CHO. Joy steals upon my spirit, and brings tears.

CLY. Aye, thy moist eye well proves thy kindly heart.

CHO. Well now—but hast thou certain proof of this?

CLY. I have—why not? or heaven has played us false.

CHO. What, is it some fair vision that thou heed'st?

CLY. I take not notions from a drowsy soul.—

CHO. But art thou sure no wingless tale has cheered thee?

CLY. Thou mock'st, it seems, my sense as a young girl's.

CHO. Well—but what time then has the town been taken?

CLY. Why, on the night that brought this morn, I say.

CHO. And who could make such haste as messenger?

CLY. No less than Vulcan, sending forth from Ida

question, how to account for the prefix *ἀ*. The common expedient for this and most other difficulties of the kind is *ἀ* intensive. Symmons ingeniously accounts for it by *ἀ* privative, understanding a smooth and rapid flight without moving the wings, like the bird in Virg. *Æn.* V. Müller, in his Review of Klausen's *Agamemnon*, throws out quite a different suggestion, that the word refers to two lines immediately preceding, which have been lost, where the Chorus had inquired whether it was some *winged* omen that she was trusting to. Klausen himself makes *ἀπτερος φάτις* the opposite to *ἔπειτα πτερόεντα*, and equivalent to *ἀναυδος φάτις*, an unuttered thought. Hermann, in a paper on Müller's Review (*Opusc.* VII. 45), considers it merely as a metaphor from an unfledged bird, and so would construe it "immature" or "crude," apparently without any reference to the wings of speech. Possibly Müller may be right in the meaning he gives to *ἀπτερος*, while the reference

may be not to any thing lost, which is at all times a bold supposition, but to *ὀνείρων φάσματ'*. (Compare v. 412, 13. *βέβακεν ὄψις οὐ μεθύστερον πτεροῖς ὁπαδοῖς ὕπνου κελεύθοις*.) *ἀπτερος φάτις* would thus be distinguished from *reports which had flown*, whether, as dreams, from the gods, or, as the actual beacon-message, from the spot where the event had occurred. Hence it would mean *a false or unfounded report*, originated nowhere but in the place where it is talked of, springing either from fancy, as Clytæmnestra by her answer supposes the imputation to mean, or from wilful deception. The Chorus, finding her disclaim any such information, proceeds to treat it as belonging to the other class of *πτερωτά φάτις*, those which had flown from the spot, and wishes to be assured of the time which it had taken to fly.

269. Peile translates 'And who can possibly have attained to this rapidity of intelligence?' Klausen, more probably, gives 'tam celeriter'

φρυκτὸς δὲ φρυκτὸν δεῦρ' ἀπ' ἀγγάρου πυρὸς  
ἔπεμπεν· Ἰδὴ μὲν, πρὸς Ἑρμαῖον λέπας  
Λήμνου· μέγαν δὲ πανὸν ἐκ νήσου τρίτον  
'Αθῶν αἶπος Ζηνὸς ἐξεδέξατο·

ὑπερτελής τε, πόντον ὥστε νωτίσαι, 275  
ισχύς πορευτοῦ λαμπάδος πρὸς ἡδονὴν  
πεύκη, τὸ χρυσοφεγγές, ὥς τις ἥλιος,  
σέλας παραγγείλασα Μακίστου σκοπαῖς·  
ὁ δ' οὔ τι μέλλων, οὐδ' ἀφρασμόνως ὕπνῳ  
νικώμενος, παρήκεν ἀγγέλου μέρος· 280

ἐκάς δὲ φρυκτοῦ φῶς ἐπ' Εὐρίπου ῥοὰς  
Μεσαπίου φύλαξι σημαίνει μολόν.  
οἱ δ' ἀντέλαμψαν καὶ παρήγγειλαν πρόσω,  
γραίας ἐρείκης θωμὸν ἄψαντες πυρί.  
σθένουσα λαμπὰς δ' οὐδέπω μαυρουμένη, 285  
ὑπερθοροῦσα πεδίον Ἀσωποῦ, δίκην  
φαιδρᾶς σελήνης, πρὸς Κιθαιρῶνος λέπας,  
ἡγειρεν ἄλλην ἐκδοχὴν πομποῦ πυρός.  
φάος δὲ τηλέπομπον οὐκ ἡναίνετο  
φρουρὰ, πλέον καίουσα τῶν εἰρημένων· 290  
λίμνην δ' ὑπὲρ Γοργῶπιν ἔσκηψεν φάος,  
ὄρος τ' ἐπ' Αἰγίπλαγκτον ἐξικνούμενον,  
ᾧ τρυνε θεσμὸν μηχαρίζεσθαι πυρός.  
πέμπουσι δ' ἀνδαίοντες ἀφθόνῳ μένει

for τόδε τάχος (τάχος as in v. 914, Eum. 124), which leaves ἀγγέλων to go with τίς.

276. Symmons is rather hypercritical in objecting to πρὸς ἡδονήν, which, were there a verb, might very well express the exulting passage of the beacon, as Clytæmnestra now gives full rein to her imagination, and as she follows the light from stage to stage invests it with life; but his suggestion προσήνυτεν,

though mentioned by none of the subsequent editors except Haupt (who has a notion that the Quarterly Review of Blomfield's edition, in which it was originally proposed, was by Elmsley), is exceedingly probable, and, should there appear need to alter the passage at all, claims preference over the other changes which have been proposed for different words.

279, 80. "παρήκεν cum negatione

A brilliant light; beacon sped beacon on,  
 Caught from the courier-flame: Ida to Lemnos,  
 And its Hermæan ridge: then next the third,  
 The height of Athos, Jove's own hill, received  
 The mighty torch-fire, from the island sent—  
 And soaring high, to overcast the sea,  
 The greatness of the travelling lamp fared on,  
 A pine-tree blaze, transmitting, like a sun,  
 Its golden radiance to Makistus' watch:—  
 Who not delaying nor in careless wise  
 O'ercome by sleep neglects a herald's part,  
 But far away on to Euripus' stream  
 Tells to Messapium's guards the light's approach:  
 And they in turn lit up and sped it on,  
 Kindling with fire a pile of aged heath.  
 Then in its strength the lamp, not yet grown dim,  
 Quick leaping o'er the Asopus' meadow, like  
 The joyous moon, towards Cithæron's ridge,  
 Woke up a new relay of missioned flame—  
 There too the watch spurned not the fiery gift  
 Far sent, but lit up brighter than the rest,  
 And o'er the lake Gorgopis shot the light,  
 And to the mount of Ægiplancton coming,  
 Urged them to keep the ordinance of flame—  
 And they, with might unstinted kindling it,

in οὐ τι μέλλων κ. τ. λ. arctius jungendum: *nequaquam cunctanter omisit.*" Butler (curæ secundæ).

293. μηχαρίζεσθαι, Wellauer's correction, though occurring nowhere else, is justly preferred by Peile to the other alterations of μὴ χαρίζεσθαι (which Haupt defends as a *litotes*!), quoting, what is nothing to the purpose, οὐ καπηλεύσειν μάχην from Sept. 545)—δὴ χαρίζεσθαι, Triclinius in the Farnese MS. where δὴ is unmeaning—μοι χαρίζεσθαι Casaubon, where the notion of obliging Clytæmnestra is not a very natural one—μὴ χαρίζεσθαι, Heath, followed by

most of the later editors, including Blomfield, though he doubts if it be Greek—νιν χαρίζεσθαι Voss, where the confusion of νιν and μὴ is not very probable,—or μῆχαρ ἵζεσθαι, Stanley and Klausen, who should at least have quoted a parallel for so strange an expression 'urged the watch that the *expedient* of fire should be set up.' The harshness of the term μῆχαρ disappears in μηχαρίζεσθαι, which we may assume to be used in a secondary sense like μηχανᾶσθαι (compare Liddell and Scott), the primary one of *devising as a cure* having passed off.

φλογὸς μέγαν πώγωνα, καὶ Σαρωνικοῦ 295  
 πορθμοῦ κάτοπτρον πρῶν' ὑπερβάλλειν πρόσω  
 φλέγουσαν· εἴτ' ἔσκηψεν, εἴτ' ἀφίκετο  
 Ἀραχναῖον αἶπος, ἀστυγείτονας σκοπὰς·  
 κᾶπειτ' Ἀτρειδῶν εἰς τόδε σκήπτει στέγος  
 φάος τόδ', οὐκ ἄπαππον Ἰδαίου πυρός. 300  
 τοιοῖδ' ἔτοιμοι λαμπαδηφόρων νόμοι,  
 ἄλλος παρ' ἄλλου διαδοχαῖς πληρούμενοι·  
 νικᾷ δ' ὁ πρῶτος καὶ τελευταῖος δραμών.  
 τέκμαρ τοιοῦτο ξύμβολόν τε σοὶ λέγω,  
 ἀνδρὸς παραγγείλαντος ἐκ Τροίας ἐμοί. 305  
 ΧΟ. θεοῖς μὲν αὖθις, ὦ γύναι, προσεύξομαι·  
 λόγους δ' ἀκούσαι τούσδε κᾶποθαυμάσαι  
 διηνεκῶς θέλοιμ' ἄν, ὥς λέγοις πάλιν.

295. φλογὸς μέγαν πώγωνα—φλέγουσαν. If the text as it stands be genuine, φλέγουσαν must be accounted for by the considerations stated on v. 118. But there are other difficulties: *'importuna ista particula καὶ,'* as Butler calls it, and the construction of ὑπερβάλλειν, which has been variously explained, as a subjoined infinitive after φλέγουσαν, and as dependent on πέμπουσι. None of the conjectures proposed however furnish any temptation to depart from the common reading. κάτοπτρον πρῶν', the MSS. reading, has been rightly restored by Klausen and Peile, who refer to Persæ 132. 879. in both which places πρῶν is used for a projecting piece of *water*, with a qualifying epithet, such as is κάτοπτρον here.

303. νικᾷ δ' ὁ πρῶτος κ. τ. λ. Peile and Linwood, though slightly differing in the method of construction, agree in referring this line to one and the same victor, 'the first who run on to the last;' 'a striking peculiarity,' says the former, differing it from the ordinary λαμπαδηφορία. But where is the pecu-

liarity? If there was any transmission in the real λαμπαδηφορία, as is evident from the allusions to it in Lucretius and Persius, the same might be said of it; those who started first and afterwards gave up the torch to others, lived in their successors no less than the beacon on Ida in that on Arachnæum. The omission of the article, which Linwood notices, no more proves, as Butler showed long ago, that the same party is spoken of throughout, than does the similar expression τῶν ἀλόντων καὶ κρατησάντων ten lines lower down. Nor yet need we seek for reasons why the first and last beacons are singled out for honour, such as that commonly given, that the one was the ultimate, the other the immediate source of the intelligence. The more natural view seems to be that Clytæmnestra in her joy wishes to honour all, and names the first and last, leaving the rest to be implied: 'last wins as well as first.'

308. ὥς λέγοις πάλιν. We can scarcely hope to understand this expression (which Blomfield changes



Send the great beard of fire on, blazing up  
Far on to passing o'er the mirror strait  
Of the Saronic gulf: and then it shot,  
And then it came to the Arachnæan height,  
The watchtower neighbouring to this city here;  
Then shoots to this our roof, the Atridæ's roof,  
The light, linked on to Ida's grandsire flame—  
Such is the fashion of our Race of Lamps,  
Each in succession ministering to each,  
And both alike are conquerors, first and last.  
Such proof and token show I forth to thee,  
My lord the source that sent it me from Troy.

CHO. To Heaven again, O lady, I will pray:

But, for thy words, I fain would hear at length  
And wonder at them, wouldst thou speak once more.

into ὥς λέγεις or εἰ λέγεις, Bothe, followed by Dindorf, into οὕς λέγεις) without examining the words separately, and viewing the adverb or conjunction and the optative not as a concrete phrase, but as two independent terms. ὥς then appears to be an adverbial form from the relative ὅς, connected with it as ἀξίως with ἄξιος. ἀξίως means 'in a worthy way.' ὥς then will mean 'in which way.' It will vary accordingly in meaning as the relative varies; where ὅς would be a simple relative, merely connecting one fact with another, ὥς will express comparison; where the relative would express a closer connection, e. g. that of cause and effect, like the Latin *qui* with the subj., the sense of the adverbial form will be similarly modified; where the relative would have the force of an exclamation (though here the Greeks rather employ some word like ὅσος or οἷος than the simple relative), ὥς will be exclamatory, 'in what way' or 'how.' Keeping this fundamental meaning of ὥς in mind, we proceed to inquire, what is the force of the opta-

tive? Common grammarians will tell us that placed by itself it can only express a wish;—connected with ἄν it will denote a greater or less contingency; and so on. Lately, doubts have been raised as to this wonderful power of ἄν, converting into some kind of contingency what without its aid would never have been a contingency at all: and with reason. How is it that after words like ἵνα, ὅφρα, ὅπως, and ὥς, the optative is used both with and without ἄν, evidently with only a small modification in the sense? After ascribing so much force to ἄν, it will not do to say here that the change is made by ὥς, &c.; it is evident that the conjunctions or adverbs do not affect the question. The simple truth must be that the optative without ἄν may express a contingency; of what kind, or how differing from that expressed by the optative with ἄν, is another matter. We can see how it comes to be used for a wish: for what is a wish but a contingency depending on the hypothesis that our will is to be consulted? Nor is it hard to ac-



ΚΛ. Τροίαν Ἀχαιοὶ τῇδ' ἔχουσ' ἐν ἡμέρα.

οἶμαι βοὴν ἄμικτον ἐν πόλει πρέπειν.

310

ὄξος τ' ἄλειφά τ' ἐκχέας ταυτῷ κύτει,

διχοστατοῦντ' ἂν, οὐ φίλω, προσενέποις.

καὶ τῶν ἀλόντων καὶ κρατησάντων δίχα

φθογγὰς ἀκούειν ἐστὶ, συμφορᾶς διπλῆς.

οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀμφὶ σώμασιν πεπτωκότες

315

ἀνδρῶν κασιγνήτων τε καὶ φυταλμίων,

παῖδες γερόντων, οὐκέτ' ἐξ ἐλευθέρου

δέρης ἀποιμώζουσι φιλτάτων μόρον.

τοὺς δ' αὖτε νυκτίπλαγκτος ἐκ μάχης πόνος

νῆστις πρὸς ἀρίστοισιν, ὧν ἔχει πόλις,

320

τάσσει, πρὸς οὐδὲν ἐν μέρει τεκμήριον,

count for *ὥς* or *εἰ* used in a wish ;— the one expressing the contingency in the form of a substantive clause, a kind of accusative to a verb understood, as *ὥς ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος*, 'I wish for the event of another's destruction;' the other carrying out the hypothesis, 'If such and such things were to happen, my pleasure would then be fulfilled,' a formula to which some may wish to reduce *ὥς*\*, 'In the event' or 'in the case according to which.' The optative indeed occurs much oftener in the sense of a wish than in that of any other contingency, perhaps designedly, the Greeks not wishing to use an expression of which the meaning might be doubtful, when they could express the contingency with a slight modification by adding *ἂν*, as it is very seldom that a greater

contingency will not do as well as a less, and *vice versa*.—What then is there to hinder us from construing *ὥς λέγοις πάλιν* 'in such wise' (*τὼς ὥς*) or 'in order that thou mightest speak again?' Surely not the common rule, to which Blomfield seems to allude when he says '*ὥς λέγοις solœcum sonat*,'—the rule that *ὥς* and such words are used with the optative when the principal verb is in a *past* tense: for if the optative conveys a *past* notion, as such a rule seems to imply, the fact of the principal verb being in the optative, though in a present tense, must be sufficient to warrant us in expecting an optative also in the subjoined clause. I have however thought it better, while preserving the sense of the optative, to take *ὥς* nearly as if it had been written *εἰ*, as

\* Those who, like Kenrick in Arnold's *Thucyd.* vol. 3. take *εἰ* for *ἦ*, will find no difficulty in treating *εἰ* and *ὥς* in exactly the same way. I believe however that *εἰ* may be more probably derived from the imperative of *εἰμι*, as if it were *ἔστω*, just as *si* appears to come from *sum*, as if it were *sit*. It is curious further to compare the two verbs of permission in Greek and Latin, *ἐάω* and *sino*, which seem to come from similar sources, the same imperatives, each meaning 'to let be.' There are many other instances of conjunctions formed from imperatives; e. g. according to Horne Tooke's view, our own *if* from *gif* or *give*, *but* from *bate*, or as others say, from *be out*, and from the Saxon *anad*, *add* or *annex*. We know how *and* is used for *if*, sometimes coupled with it, by our old writers: and it may be worth inquiring whether *ἂν*, *ἐὰν* may not be connected with our *and* or *an*.

CLY. Now, on this day, the Greeks are holding Troy!—  
 A diverse shout, I ween, rings loud therein—  
 Pour in one vessel vinegar and oil,  
 And foes will be thy name for them—not friends.  
 So of the captured and the capturers now  
 Two voices are there, for their twofold chance.  
 For those, fallen down about the bodies slain  
 Of husbands, brothers, fathers—children bending  
 O'er old men dead, from throats no longer free  
 Wail that their dearest friends on earth are gone.  
 While these, night-wandering labour after fight  
 Fasting to fare such as the town supplies  
 Sets down, no token given to fix their place,

having the force of 'provided that;' a sense which enables it, like *ut* in Latin, to stand occasionally for *when* or *while*, a certain time being viewed as a condition of the action expressed in the sentence: e. g. in Soph. Aj. 1116. τοῦ δὲ σοῦ ψόφου Οὐκ ἂν στραφείην ὥς ἂν ἦς οἶος περ εἶ, where in spite of the emendations of Brunck, Wunder, &c. it is easy to see how ὥς expresses time as a *condition*.

312. Peile thinks οὐ φίλως, the common reading, is 'vastly more spirited' than οὐ φίλω, Stanley's correction, which Schutz, Porson, Butler, and Blomfield have adopted. Not agreeing with him, I have translated according to οὐ φίλω. What would φίλως διχοστατεῖν be?

316. "φυταλμίων. *affinium*, nescio an hoc de parentibus intellexerint interpretes." Klausen. On the contrary, the question to be asked is rather why any other meaning than that of *parental* (φυταλμίοις· φυτευτικοῖς. Hesych.) has ever been assumed for it. The only passage which seems to require a different meaning, Soph. Œd. Col. 150. ἀλαῶν ὀμμάτων ἄρα καὶ ἦσθα φυτάλμιος δυσ-αίων, in reality fully admits of the sense *parent*, Œdipus' misery being supposed to be heightened by the

fact that he seemed to be a parent, and thus entitled to respect and honour, whereas he was still δυσ-αίων.

321. πρὸς οὐδὲν ἐν μέρει τεκμήριον. Peile construes 'according to no ticket *presented* in turn:' but ἐν μέρει could hardly be so connected with τεκμήριον in the absence of an article. πρὸς οὐδὲν τεκμήριον must be taken together in an adverbial sense, qualifying ἐν μέρει. To what then does ἐν μέρει refer? To the arrangement of the parties at the meal, or the division of the meal itself? Schutz and Klausen apparently understand the latter: Linwood, the former, translating 'in no regular turn or order,' which is confirmed by v. 1159 below, Eum. 198, 436, 586. It might still be a question whether μέρος referred to the class or rank, or to the individual; but the latter seems most likely.—Blomfield apparently confounds the two senses of *arrangement* and *division*, rendering with Linwood *alternis vicibus*, yet approving of Schutz's 'nullo certo distributionis signo observato,' unless he supposes the distribution to be one of parties at the table.

325. It is undoubtedly possible that the old reading δυσδαίμονες may

ἀλλ' ὥς ἕκαστος ἔσπασεν τύχης πάλον·  
 ἐν αἰχμαλώτοις Τρωϊκοῖς οἰκήμασιν  
 ναίουσιν ἤδη, τῶν ὑπαιθρίων πάγων  
 δρόσων τ' ἀπαλλαγέστες· ὥς δ' εὐδαίμονες 325  
 ἀφύλακτον εὐδήσουσι πᾶσαν εὐφρόνην.  
 εἰ δ' εὖ σέβουσι τοὺς πολισσούχους θεοὺς  
 τοὺς τῆς ἀλούσης γῆς, θεῶν θ' ἰδρύματα,  
 οὐκ ἂν γ' ἐλόντες αὖθις ἀνθαλῶεν ἂν.  
 ἔρως δὲ μή τις πρότερον ἐμπίπτοι στρατῷ 330  
 πορθεῖν ἅ μὴ χρῆ, κέρδεσιν νικωμένους.  
 δεῖ γὰρ πρὸς οἴκους νοστήμου σωτηρίας  
 κάμψαι διαύλου θάτερον κῶλον πάλιν.  
 θεοῖς δ' ἂν, ἀμπλάκητος εἰ μόλοι στρατὸς,

be the true one. Klausen remarks truly 'quamquam est in cogitatione aliquid insoliti, nihil tamen falsi;' and the common point of having nothing to care for is enough ground for a comparison between the prosperous and the necessitous. But the question is not whether, speaking abstractedly, the thought might not find place in a poem, but whether it is in its place in Clytæmnestra's speech. Could *δυσδαίμονες* here mean any thing else but simple poverty (which, by the way, though a necessary, is not a very natural sense for it, as it is scarcely equivalent to *πένητες*), a reason might be seen for its being put into her mouth, as she would be by no means averse from pointing out any thing which might hint at the instability of their position, and the words *εἰ δ' εὖ σέβουσι* afterwards would follow as a correction, to make the Chorus think she was only speaking from excess of caution. But poverty must be the meaning: her allusion must then be to the careless happiness of the poor, a sentiment not particularly in keeping with her character (for a passage like v. 1544 proves nothing), and besides introduced purposely to

illustrate the happiness of the conquerors, which throughout she is rather anxious to cloud than to brighten. Further, some connecting particle is absolutely required in the sentence, so that if we were not to read *ὥς δ' εὐδαίμονες*, or something similar, we should have to accept Schutz's *τῶν δ' ὑπαιθρίων πάγων*. Of the various corrections which have been proposed, it requires but little consideration to see that *ὥς δ' εὐδαίμονες* is the best, tinged as it is with the gloom which hangs over the whole speech, as it will not admit that they *are* happy, but only that they will act as if they were.—*ὥστ' εὐδαίμονες*, Halm's conjecture adopted by Hermann, would express their happiness as a certainty, beside being further removed from the MSS. reading.—Hermann's own suggestion, *ὥς δὲ δαίμονες*, though adopted by Dindorf, seems out of place, as no one would naturally think of saying that men were like the gods because they slept unguarded: while Orelli's *ὥς (δ'?) ὁμαίμονες* is equally objectionable with the old reading, containing a thought, only abstractedly just.—*ἀφύλακτον* points to the comfort both of those

But just as each has drawn the lot of luck :  
 There in the captured dwelling homes of Troy  
 They live already, from the sky's sharp frosts  
 And dews set free : and like the poor will sleep  
 Without a guard through all the length of night.  
 Now, if they duly fear the city's gods,  
 Those of the conquered country, and their shrines,  
 The spoilers will not in their turn be spoiled.  
 But let no rage first seize upon the host  
 Of plundering things forbid from lust of gain.  
 For the long course ere they can come back safe  
 Has yet another side for them to measure :

who have no need to employ guards, and those who no longer employed as guards may now sleep without dread of being aroused *πάσαν εὐφρόνην*.

330. With Dindorf I prefer *ἐμπίπτοι*, the reading of the Flor. and Farn. MSS. (in the former from a correction), to the common text *ἐμπίπτῃ*, though that is doubtless defensible. It is hard to say on what principle grammarians assume the ellipse of *ὄρα* or *φοβητέον* in instances like this, where *μή* occurs with the present subj., at the same time that they maintain that when the subj. is used with *μή* in the sense of the imperative, it must always be in the aorist, as it is obvious that the ellipse may be assumed in the latter case no less than in the former, so that it furnishes no real ground for the difference.

331. *πορθεῖν* independently of its MSS. authority, is better than *ποθεῖν*, which is repeated in *κέρδεσιν νικωμένους*.

332. On the whole it seems best to take *πρὸς οἶκους νοστήμου σωτηρίας* like *συμφορᾶς διπλῆς* v. 314, 'in respect of their safe return home,' as Haupt appears to understand it from his version '*opus eos est ad felicitem reditum in patriam.*' Schutz, in a

note adopted by Dindorf, says, '*ordo verborum hic est: δεῖ γὰρ (αὐτοὺς) θάτερον κῶλον διαύλου πάλιν κάμψαι, νοστήμου σωτηρίας πρὸς οἶκους,*' seemingly understanding *κῶλον* again before *νοστ. σωτ.*; but this would be harsh. Peile makes *νοστ. σωτ.* the genitive after *δεῖ*, taking the next line (as far as can be understood from his note) either as another genitive in apposition, *τοῦ κάμψαι*, or as an infinitive denoting the consequence, *ὥστε κάμψαι*, and thus in either case infringing its force. The sense would be still better if we could suppose *δεῖ* with a genitive to have the double force which *ἐλλείπω* seems to have, expressing not merely 'to lack so much,' but 'to be lacking of a particular thing,' so that we might take *κάμψαι* as the nom. and render "for there is lacking of (i. e. in order to) their safe return home that they should turn," &c. *δέω* appears to be used for *desum* more properly than for *desidero*, meaning primarily *to bind*, hence *to be needful*, and thus *to be lacking*, so that e. g. *τοῦ πάντος δέω* may be explained, 'I fail in respect of the whole,' and thus the sense 'I am in need of' comes to be assumed.

334. The views of those who would keep the old reading *θεοῖς δ'*

- ἐγρηγορὸς τὸ πῆμα τῶν ὀλωλότων 335  
 γένοιτ' ἂν, εἰ πρόσπαια μὴ τύχοι κακά.  
 τοιαῦτά μοι γυναικὸς ἐξ ἐμοῦ κλύοις.  
 τὸ δ' εὖ κρατοίη, μὴ διχορρόπως ἰδεῖν.  
 πολλῶν γὰρ ἐσθλῶν τὴν ὄνησιν εἰλόμην.  
 ΧΟ. γύναι, κατ' ἄνδρα σώφρον' εὐφρόνως λέγεις. 340  
 ἐγὼ δ', ἀκούσας πιστά σου τεκμήρια,  
 θεοὺς προσειπεῖν εὖ παρασκευάζομαι.  
 χάρις γὰρ οὐκ ἄτιμος εἴργασται πόνων.  
 ὦ Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ, καὶ νύξ φιλία,  
 μεγάλων κόσμων κτεάτειρα, 345  
 ἧτ' ἐπὶ Τροίας πύργοις ἔβαλες  
 στεγανὸν δίκτυον, ὥς μήτε μέγαν  
 μήτ' οὖν νεαρῶν τιν' ὑπερτελέσαι  
 μέγα δουλείας  
 γάγγαμον, ἄτης παναλώτου. 350  
 Δία τοι ξένιον μέγαν αἰδοῦμαι,  
 τὸν τάδε πράξαντ', ἐπ' Ἀλεξάνδρῳ

ἀναπλάκτης are substantially expressed by Linwood, who translates: 'Nay more, even though the army should return without any check on the part of the gods, yet still the crime incurred by any acts of destruction would not fail to rise against them, even though no fresh mischances should befall them,' adding, 'the words τὸ πῆμα τῶν ὀλωλότων do not refer to those slain in battle, but to any mischief committed by the army after their victory.' Why he adds this is obvious: whether he has any right to do so, is not so plain. Blomfield, though agreeing in Linwood's reading, saw that τὸ πῆμα κ. τ. λ. is parallel to τῶν πολυκτόνων γὰρ οὐκ ἄσκοποι θεοὶ in v. 444; an admission certainly injurious to his own cause, as then no mention would be made of the excesses to be committed by the ar-

my, which the connection of thought seems to require. Besides, what can be the difference in sense between ἀναπλάκτης εἰ μόλοι στρατὸς and εἰ πρόσπαια μὴ τύχοι κακά? The latter can scarcely mean any thing which has not been expressed by the former. With the reading ἀμπλάκτης or ἀπλ. all is clear; the first line refers to their supposed sacrilege; the second to the blood of the slain, which like the debt in the parable of the unforgiving creditor, though otherwise perhaps forgiven, in that case would be exacted; and the third to their possible exemption from the dangers of the deep. It is better to refer with Porson θεοῖς δ' ἂν to ἐγρηγορὸς κ. τ. λ., as though there seems to be no law of language against joining εἰ ἂν μόλοι, the order of the words is against it. Klausen thinks ἂν can hardly stand

And, in Heaven's mind, should they return in sin,  
 The vengeance of the slaughtered yet may live  
 Wakeful, though no fresh ills should first befall.  
 Such then I give thee as a woman's thoughts.  
 But O! may good prevail, and past all doubt,  
 For I have got the enjoyment of much bliss.

CHO. Lady, thou speak'st in wisdom like a man:  
 I, now that I have heard such credible proof,  
 Prepare me thus to address the gods aright:  
 For 'tis no slight reward our toils have won.—

O royal Zeus and befriending night

Who hast brought these shows of bravery—  
 Whose hand on the tower of Ilion flung  
 So mighty a net, that nor old nor young  
 Could o'erleap the encircling barrier-height

Of the toils of public slavery!

'Tis to mighty Zeus that the praise I owe,  
 To the stranger's god, who the deed hath wrought,  
 Keeping bent on Paris so long his bow,

as it does before a parenthesis; but it has the same position in Soph. Philoct. 292. *πρὸς τοῦτ' ἄν, εἰ τ' ἔδει τι καὶ ποτὸν λαβεῖν*, unless Dindorf's improbable punctuation is there to be adopted.

339. Linwood is right in translating 'the enjoyment which I have obtained is one of many blessings,' and in objecting to the change in text and meaning which Hermann would introduce.

340. *σώφρον'* may be the acc. pl. after *λέγεις*, like *ὡς σώφρον' εἶπας* in Eurip. Iph. Aul. 1024, as well as the sing. agreeing with *ἄνδρα*. *εὐφρόνως* Abresch would alter into *ἐμφρόνως*, as Auratus with Dindorf's consent changes *εὐφρον'* into *ἐμφρον'* in Choeph. 195; others would give it the sense of *φρονίμως*, quoting the use of *εὖ φρονεῖν*;—but, as Peile remarks, that is already expressed by

*σώφρον'*. The ordinary sense is quite natural: Clytæmnestra had contrived to convey an impression of her *εὐνοια* through the whole of her speech.

348. The common sense given to *στεγανὸν δίκτυον* is probably correct: 'covering,' like *δοκοὶ στεγανοὶ* Eurip. Cret. 2. 7. It might however be taken passively, as a *close compact* net, a stake-net, which had to be fixed round a person, as in v. 1350.

352, 3. *πράξαντ'—τείνοντα*. See on v. 170. *ὅπως* Peile rightly translates 'in such sort as,' after Blomfield's 'eo modo quo potissimum.' *ἄν σκήψκειν* are thus left to go together, and it is as needless to doubt, as many of the editors have done, whether such an expression is admissible, as it would be to suppose, in compliance with an ingenious suggestion, an ellipsis of *τις*, and

τείνοντα παλαι τόξον, ὅπως ἂν  
μήτε πρὸ καιροῦ μήθ' ὑπὲρ ἄστρον  
βέλος ἡλίθιον σκήψειεν.

355

Διὸς πλαγὰν ἔχουσιν εἰπεῖν.

στρ. α'.

πάρεστι τοῦτο γ' ἐξιχνεῦσαι.

ἔπραξεν, ὥς ἔκρανεν.

οὐκ ἔφα τις θεοὺς βροτῶν

ἀξιοῦσθαι μέλειν,

360

ὅσοις ἀθίκτων χάρις

πατοῖθ'· ὁ δ' οὐκ εὐσεβής.

πέφανται δ' † ἐγγόνους

ἀτολμήτων Ἄρη

πνεόντων μεῖζον ἢ δικαίως,

365

φλεόντων δωμάτων ὑπέρφεν

ὑπὲρ τὸ βέλτιστον. ἔστω δ' ἀπή-

μαντον, ὥστε κᾶπαρκεῖν

εὖ πραπίδων λαχόντα.

οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἔπαλξις

370

πλούτου πρὸς κόρον ἀνδρὶ

λακτίσαντι μέγαν δίκας

βωμὸν εἰς ἀφάνειαν.

βιάται δ' αὖ τάλαινα πειθῶ,

ἀντ. α'.

translate, 'just as a man would launch,' which would have to be taken as a condensed expression for ὅπως ἂν τείναι τις σκήψων.

356. εἰπεῖν in its full extent of meaning will be 'for themselves or others to talk about,' like λέγειν v. 837.

363. In this corrupt passage it seems clear from the connection of thought that some such sense is wanted as Blomfield has given in his correction πέφανται δ' (ὁ ἀσεβής)

ἔκγονος. That atheism springs naturally from fulness of wealth is a sentiment which Æschylus cherished not less jealously than Agur (Proverbs XXX. 9), and quite harmonizes with that further view of the Theogony of evil which we gain from v. 736, &c.

367. "ἀπήμαντον is not the subject, but the predicate, the true nominative being *a man's condition*, or some such expression." Peile; who may also be right in supposing that



That the shaft when it flew was not sent for nought,  
Not launched too soon, nor beyond the moon,  
In the pride of idle bravery.

'Tis Zeus hath struck them thus severely.  
So much may man unravel clearly.

As he planned it, so he wrought.

Yet there once was one who said  
That the immortals take no thought  
Of the men whose daring tread  
Doth their sacred shrines despite :

Wretch, of bold irreverent tongue !

Impious ! truly was he sprung

From power that breathes out war beyond all right :

Power, that dares what none may dare—

Power, whose houses great and fair

Teem with vast stores far o'er Discretion's height.

Clear from sorrow be my part,

Portion meet for prudent heart.

For wealth has no munition

For the man whose gorged ambition

Spurns at the shrine of Law Divine,

To save him from perdition.

And dire Persuasion, Child of Ruin,

the use of the imperative shews the former member of the sentence to be the measure or condition of the latter. There is however no occasion for this concession to the dogmatism which maintains that *ἔστω* cannot be used where we should use the imperative 'be' or 'let be' in English: and it seems better to supply the ellipses of the passage as follows, 'but let a man's lot be free from sorrow, so that a sensible man may be equal to circumstances (besides acquiescing from compulsion), and all will be well.' *καταπαρκεῖν* has

been variously resolved into *ἀπαρκεῖν* or *ἐπαρκεῖν*; the sense I have adopted will bear either, though perhaps the latter is better. Klausen and Peile think that *ἀπαρκεῖν* may take an accusative, as *ἀρέσκειν* sometimes does; but if it were ruled that *ἀπαρκεῖν* must refer to the subject of *ἔστω*, it would be less hazardous to read *λαχόντι* with Auratus, Schutz, and Haupt.

374. "*προβουλόπαις* nihil aliud est quam *πρόβουλος παῖς*, quemadmodum *Æschylus Choeph.* 312. *αἰνοπάτηρ* pro *αἰνὸς πατήρ* posuit." Schutz.



προβουλόπαις ἄφερτος ἄτας· 375  
 ἄκος δὲ παμμάταιον.  
 οὐκ ἐκρύφθη, πρέπει δὲ, φῶς  
 αἰνολαμπές, σίνος·  
 κακοῦ δὲ χαλκοῦ τρόπον,  
 τρίβῳ τε καὶ προσβολαῖς 380  
 μελαμπαγῆς πέλει  
 δικαιοθεῖς, ἐπεὶ  
 διώκει παῖς ποτανὸν ὄρνιν,  
 πόλει πρόστριμμ' ἄφερτον ἐνθείς.  
 λιτᾶν δ' ἀκούει μὲν οὔτις θεῶν· 385  
 τὸν δ' ἐπίστροφον τῶνδε  
 φῶτ' ἄδικον καθαιρεῖ.  
 οἶος καὶ Πάρις, ἐλθὼν  
 εἰς δόμον τὸν Ἀτρειδᾶν,  
 ἥσχυνε ξενίαν τράπε- 390  
 ζαν κλοπαῖσι γυναικός.

λιποῦσα δ' ἀστοῖσιν ἀσπίστορας στρ. β'.  
 κλόνους, λογχίμους τε καὶ ναυβάτας ὅπλισμους,  
 ἄγουσά τ' ἀντίφερνον Ἰλίου φθοράν,  
 βέβακεν ῥίμφα διὰ πυλᾶν, 395  
 ἄτλητα τλᾶσα· πολλὰ δ' ἔστενον  
 τάδ' ἐννέποντες δόμων προφήται·  
 Ἴω, ἰὼ δῶμα, δῶμα, καὶ πρόμοι·  
 ἰὼ λέχος, καὶ στίβοι φιλόνορες.

Blomfield's rendering, 'quæ posteris consulit,' leads him to separate it from ἄτας, which he refers to πειθώ: but this is very harsh. Peile seems singular in his notion that προβουλόπαις means no more than 'eldest daughter:' as if the προβουλή exercised were the care of the rest of the family of Ate, not the counsel given to the guilty man. Much to

the same purpose is Symmons' 'eldest of council in divan,' resting apparently on a mistake of the technical meaning of πρόβουλος, which is not 'one who gives the first vote,' but 'one who joins in a preliminary vote.'

376. πᾶν μάταιον, Musgrave's conjecture, adopted by Klausen as Wellauer's, and by Dindorf, is perfectly

For ever goads him to undoing ;  
 Vain is all the healer's care :  
 No, he lurks not—see him shine  
 With a lurid, baleful glare,  
 Base-born offspring of the mine,  
 At the trial-hour averred  
 By the contact of the test  
 To be foul and black of breast ;  
 For, like a boy, he hunts the flying bird,  
 With the penal load of fate  
 Crushing down his parent state :  
 Their prayers sink down, by all the gods unheard,  
 Who from off creation's face  
 Sweep the cause of their disgrace—  
 So Paris, falsely smiling,  
 Did an act of foul defiling  
 To the friendly board of Sparta's lord,  
 Its queen from home beguiling.

Leaving her peers a spear-armed power,  
 The clang of shields and nautical arraying,  
 And bringing death to Ilion for a dower,  
 Lightly through the gates she went,  
 Daring the undared : and loud was the lament  
 Of the minstrels of the house, thus saying :  
 O woe, woe for the palace and its head,  
 For the couch, and the paths she wont to tread !

superfluous. ' All cure is in vain ' is no improvement in sense upon ' cure is all in vain.'

377. φῶς, as Peile remarks, may be either an accusative after πρέπει (see on v. 30) or a nominative in apposition.

385. λιτᾶν I take to be the prayers of the city, which are disregarded, though the cause of the disaster is destroyed. τὸν δ' ἐπίστροφον is introduced as if it were a new subject.

399. The most natural meaning of στίβοι φιλάνορες surely is ' the paths she used to walk in while she loved her husband,' either when walking by his side, or coming to meet him, or at any rate when thinking of him. There is no need of trying to force στίβοι into meaning as much as *vestigia*, as Peile seems inclined to do in his translation ' objects stamped with the image of an affectionate wife.'

πάρεστι σιγᾶς, ἄτιμος, ἀλοίδορος,  
ἄδιστος ἀφεμένων ἰδεῖν.

400

πόθω δ' ὑπερποντίας  
φάσμα δόξει δόμων ἀνάσσειν·  
εὐμόρφων δὲ κολοσσῶν  
ἔχθεται χάρις ἀνδρί·  
ὀμμάτων δ' ἐν ἀχηνίαις  
ἔρρει πᾶς Ἀφροδίτα.

405

ὄνειρόφαντοι δὲ πενθήμονες  
πάρεισι δόξαι φέρουσαι χάριν ματαίαν.  
μάταν γὰρ, εὖτ' ἂν ἐσθλά τις δοκῶν ὄρᾳ,

ἀντ. β'.

410

400. I have followed Peile in his version of the text as it stands, which gives a better sense than any of the proposed alterations. The word ἀνδρὶ in v. 405 furnishes a presumption that Menelaus is there mentioned for the first time: and if there is no reason either on the ground of language or on that of poetical thought for intending him here, any consideration against it may be held as tolerably decisive. As to the language of the passage, it tells clearly against him; σιγᾶς and ἄδιστος at least must be altered to suit him, while if we suppose Helen to be meant, no change need be made. The question of the poetry must be of course one of taste: I can only offer my translation as expressing my notion of what is likely to have been in the mind of Æschylus: though there is I think a tangible objection to the harsh transition from Menelaus wasting till he becomes like a ghost (which the words φάσμα δόξει moreover do not naturally express) to his loathing the beautiful statues. Take the φάσμα to be the image of Helen, comparing Constance's speech in K. John quoted by Sew-

ell, and the link in the thought is most natural: 'her image will seem to us to fill her vacant throne; most ineffectual substitute—as indeed are all substitutes when the original is wanting; the statues do not satisfy him: no! he turns from them with loathing: they but remind him of what he has not; and in that craving of the eye all sense of beauty vanishes.' Very recently, Mrs. Coleridge, in an appendix to the new edition of her father's *Biographia Literaria*, has commented on this passage at length, expressing herself rather confidently that she has consulted the requirements of the poetry, if not those of the language. She would refer the whole to Menelaus, not even allowing that vv. 404—407 contain any reference to Helen. The peculiarities of her version are that she thinks that Menelaus can be called ἄδιστος ἀφεμένων, 'mild-est of forsaken men,' that εὐμόρφων κ. τ. λ. can mean 'the grace of the full rounded statue is alienated from the man,' (she is not sure whether ἔχθεται can mean this, but she is sure that this meaning is wanted, and that if ἔχθεται should be judged impracticable, it ought to be cor-

She stands in silence, scorned, yet unrebuking,  
 Most sweetly, sorrowfully looking  
 Of brides that have from wedlock fled :  
 And grief for her beyond the main  
 Shall raise her phantom in his halls to reign.  
 No more in rapture mute he  
 Beholds her sculptured beauty ;  
 In the blank that lies before his eyes  
 All lost is Venus' duty.

And semblances of mournful dreams  
 Crowd round his bed, a fond enjoyment bringing :  
 For vainly, when to view bright shapes he seems,

rected)—and finally that ὀμμάτων κ. τ. λ. must signify 'in the hollows of his eyes all beauty fades away.' Whether this can stand on æsthetical grounds must be settled elsewhere ; its chance from philological considerations the reader will have determined already. She brings however a series of objections to the general view of the passage, as here given. δόμων ἀνάσσειν can scarcely be said of Helen ; to say that Menelaus found no consolation in statues for the loss of his wife is to say very little ; and it is clumsy to bring Helen in first as a day dream, then as a night vision. Peile has already remarked that though to *Menelaus* Helen would not appear to be mistress of the house, in relation to the προφῆται the expression δ. ἀ. may properly be applied to her. The statues are probably statues of Helen : and in that case it is scarcely necessary to indicate the feeling which is painfully sensible of the utter disparity between a mere likeness and the absent original. If any evidence be wanted, the passage quoted by Symmons from Xenoph. Symp. will be sufficient : ὅτι, ὁ Σώκρατες, ἡ μὲν αὐτοῦ ὄψις εὐφραίνειν δύναται, ἡ δὲ τοῦ εἰδώλου τέρψιν μὲν οὐ

παρέχει, πόθον δὲ ἐμποιεῖ. And what can be more natural, and consequently less clumsy, than to follow the mourners through the day, as Virgil follows Dido in *Æn.* IV. 56. sqq., and picture them as haunted by her image while awake, finding no satisfaction in the sculptured likenesses, and at night closing their eyes only to see her again, with the momentary feeling that she is really among them ?

410. Peile rightly denies that the participle can be put for the finite verb (in the cases of εἰ with the participle it will be useful to bear in mind the conjectural derivation of εἰ given in the foot-note on v. 308, according to which εἰ δέ τις βουλόμενος would naturally mean 'be there any one wishing') ; but his explanation amounts to no more than saying that ἡ is understood. It is difficult to say why Scholefield's δοκῶν ὄρα, involving merely the supposition of a confusion between ὄραι and ὄραν, should have been not only not received but entirely passed over by subsequent editors, Linwood alone mentioning it. I have had little hesitation in receiving it into the text.

παραλλάξασα διὰ χερῶν  
 βέβακεν ὄψις οὐ μεθύστερον  
 πτεροῖς ὀπαδοῖς ὕπνου κελεύθοις.  
 τὰ μὲν κατ' οἴκους ἐφ' ἐστίας ἄχη  
 τάδ' ἐστὶ, καὶ τῶνδ' ὑπερβατώτερα. 415  
 τὸ πᾶν δ' ἀφ' Ἑλλάδος αἴας συνορμένοις  
 πένθεια τλησικάρδιος  
 δόμων ἐκάστου πρέπει.  
 πολλὰ γοῦν θιγγάνει πρὸς ἡπαρ·  
 οὓς μὲν γάρ τις ἔπεμψεν 420  
 οἶδεν, ἀντὶ δὲ φωτῶν  
 τεύχη καὶ σποδὸς εἰς ἐκάσ-  
 του δόμους ἀφικνεῖται.

ὁ χρυσαμοιβὸς δ' Ἀρης σωμάτων, στρ. γ'.  
 καὶ ταλαντεύχως ἐν μάχῃ δορὸς, 425  
 πυρωθὲν ἐξ Ἰλίου φίλοισι  
 πέμπει βαρὺ ψῆγμα δυσδάκρυτον,  
 ἀντήνορος σποδοῦ γεμί-

417. πένθεια τλησικάρδιος, 'stout-hearted grief; i. e. such as a stout heart only can struggle with.' Peile. It would be more correct to say that the qualities of the mourner are transferred to the sorrow itself. Stanley's 'tabificus' refers to his own or rather Auratus' conjecture *τηξικάρδιος*.

418. Though Auratus' *δόμοις* has been mentioned by several of the editors, no one seems to have thought that *δόμων* requires to be defended against it. Yet it is difficult to see how the genitive is to be understood. 'In domibus cujusque cernitur,' says Haupt, as though it were equivalent to *δόμοις*, which he expressly disapproves. 'Domi unius-cujusque ortus est luctus,' is Klausen's rendering, apparently on the

supposition that it is a genitive of 'motion from,' and that *πρέπει* can imply some kind of motion. *δόμων* can hardly stand for *ἐπὶ δόμων*, like *ἐπ' ὀμμάτων* in v. 1398; nor can its construction be the same as in vv. 314, 332: still less can it be taken with *πένθεια* or *τλησικάρδιος*. It is just conceivable that *πρέπει* may have the notion of governing, derived from that of 'towering over,' 'sitting in the front of,' and so is construed as if it were *ἀνάσσει*, *αἰσυνῶ*, or *κρατεῖ*: and Schutz's translation, 'moestitia in singulorum aedibus regnat,' shews that the same thought may have struck him. If there be an error, there can be little doubt that *δόμοις* is the right reading: *δόμφ' ἢ ἐκάστου πρέπει*, which I had thought of, would be as 'inle-

Through his hands escaping fast,  
 The beauteous vision all at once is past,  
 In the wake of sleep its journey winging.  
 E'en such are the sorrows that have been  
 In that house, and more infinitely keen :  
 Thus for the brave from Hellas' shores departed  
 Enduring sorrow, patient-hearted,  
 Seated on each one's hearth is seen ;  
 Aye, there is much, exceeding much  
 As with a dart the very soul to touch.

Each knows the names he sent them :  
 But, for the heroes lent them,  
 The dust and urn alone return  
 At home to represent them.

But Mars who changes déad like gold,  
 Whose hands in fight the balance hold,  
 The ashes from Ilion to their friends,  
 A scant weight, yet melancholy, sends,  
 Filling for men with dust

gant' as Schutz's *δοκῇ νορᾶν* in v. 410.

422. There seems not the slightest reason for supposing *τεύχη* to mean *armour*: throughout Æschylus it signifies a *vessel*, though doubtless, as Klausen shews, the sense of *armour* was equally recognised by him:—and the context is decidedly in favour of an urn being meant.

424. *σωμάτων* is properly understood by Peile as a corrective epithet, shewing that Mars acts as a gold-changer, with this exception, that his currency is human flesh, and the exchange one of ashes for living men. Schneider's 'qui in prælio vivos mortuis permutat,' and Klausen's 'qui corpora cum auro commutat,' are refuted by the context both before and after.

427. 'Scant weight' may seem a better translation of *βραχὺ* than *βαρὺ*

*ψῆγμα*: I have no doubt however that the latter is correct, for the reason given on v. 187, Æschylus' disposition to use words apparently contradictory, contrasting a physical with a moral effect. Exactly parallel is Choeph. 352. where the *heavy* tomb (*πολύχωστον*) is said to be *δω-μασιν εὐφόρητον*, while here the *ψῆγμα*, the scraping of dust, is *βαρὺ*.—I have followed Peile here and elsewhere in the arrangement of the lines: but it occurs to me to ask whether a better order would not be

*πυρωθὲν ἐξ Ἰλίου  
 φίλοισι πέμπει βαρὺ  
 ψῆγμα δυσδάκρυτον, ἀντ-  
 ήνορος κ. τ. λ.*

and in the same manner in the antistrophe (and so I see Klausen has printed them). Perhaps however Peile may be right, and vv. 426, 7 are of the same metre as vv. 397, 413.

ζων λέβητας εὐθέτους.  
 στένουσι δ' εὖ λέγοντες ἄν- 430  
 δρα τὸν μὲν, ὡς μάχης ἴδρις·  
 τὸν δ', ἐν φοναῖς καλῶς πεσόντ' ἄλ-  
 λοτρίας διαὶ γυναικός.  
 τάδε σίγά τις βαῦζει·  
 φθονερὸν δ' ὑπ' ἄλγος ἔρπει 435  
 προδίοις Ἀτρείδαις.  
 οἱ δ' αὐτοῦ περὶ τείχος  
 θήκας Ἰλιάδος γὰς  
 εὖμορφοι κατέχουσιν· ἐχ-  
 θρὰ δ' ἔχοντας ἔκρυψεν. 440

βαρεῖα δ' ἀστῶν φάτις ξὺν κότῳ· 445  
 δημοκράντου δ' ἀρᾶς τίνει χρέος.  
 μένει δ' ἀκοῦσαί τί μου μέριμνα  
 νυκτηρεφές. τῶν πολυκτόνων γὰρ  
 οὐκ ἄσκοποι θεοί· κελαι-  
 ναὶ δ' Ἑρινύες χρόνῳ  
 τυχηρὸν ὄντ' ἄνευ δίκας  
 παλιντυχῇ τριβᾷ βίου  
 τιθείσ' ἀμαυρὸν, ἐν δ' αἵστοις  
 τελέθοντος οὔτις ἀλκά. 450  
 τὸ δ' ὑπερκότῳ κλύειν εὖ  
 βαρύ· βάλλεται γὰρ ὅσσοις

429. εὐθέτους, Auratus' conjecture, may probably have been changed to εὐθέτου, to avoid the syntax τοὺς λέβητας εὐθέτους, by those who retained the article (Wellauer), or the last letter may have dropped out from the next word beginning with σ. 'In order just' is scarcely a proper equivalent for εὐθέτους, which is more likely to mean light, 'easily disposed of,' as Butler understands εὐθέτου.

439. ἔχοντας has evidently a dou-

ble meaning, which Auratus' ελόν-  
 τας, so far from expressing more  
 clearly, as Haupt fancies, would only  
 obscure. I have tried to express it  
 in my version, where perhaps the  
 word 'boulders' may seem to need  
 some excuse; but I think it may  
 fairly be applied to the immense  
 masses of stone which one may con-  
 ceive to have been heaped together  
 about the rampart.

447. τυχηρὸν ὄντ' ἄνευ δίκας may  
 appear to confirm Wellauer's cor-

The urns in order just.  
 The mourners each one's praise recite—  
 How one did deeds of martial might,  
 And one was nobly slain in fight  
 For a woman—and her, another's!—  
 So men mutter as they weep,  
 While jealous hate begins to creep  
 On those avenging brothers.  
 And a goodly remnant moulders  
 Beneath the stony boulders  
 At the ramparts' base: and the hostile place  
 Entombs them, *now* its holders.

Dire are the murmurs of the crowd  
 As public curses breathed aloud:  
 My mind from the darkness waits to hear  
 A voice; for the immortals will not clear  
 The manslayer of his crime:  
 Erinnyes in due time  
 By life's just process sure though slow  
 From guilty greatness brings him low:  
 There, sunk in midnight, he can know  
 No hope of a morrow brightening.  
 O! man's loud praises are but pain;  
 Zeus hears them, and in high disdain

rection of Eum. 554. τὰ πολλὰ παντόφυρτον ὄντ' ἄνευ δίκας: but there I believe the whole passage should be read as follows: τὸν ἀντίτολμον δὲ φάμι καὶ παραιβάταν τὰ πολλὰ παντόφορτ' ἄνευ δίκας βιαίως ξὺν χρόνῳ καθήσειν, λαῖφος ὅταν λάβῃ πόνος θραυόμενος κεραίας, inserting καὶ before παραιβάταν with Hermann, and understanding καθήσειν with Butler. At any rate the word παντόφορτος, with which compare αὐτόφορτος, Choeph. 675, ought to be substituted for παντόφυρτος.

451. ὑπερκότως. The best account of the derivation of this word is that

given by Liddell and Scott under ἀλλόκοτος, which supposes κότος, like ὄργη, to have the sense of ἡθος. The sense of words of this class, such as παλίγκοτος, will then be determined by the word with which each is compounded; so that here the gloss of the Farnese MS. may be accepted, ἤγουν τὸ λίαν, ἀπλῶς.

452. Peile greatly admires Klausen's interpretation, 'Ejicitur enim oculis a Jove fulmen:' but the passages which the latter adduces are not to the point. The Greeks do not attribute any governing virtue to the eyes of the gods, further than



Διόθεν κεραυνός.

κρίνω δ' ἄφθονον ὄλβον.

μήτ' εἶην πτολιπόρθης,

μήτ' οὖν αὐτὸς ἀλοὺς ὑπ' ἄλ-

λων βίον κατίδοιμι.

455

πυρὸς δ' ὑπ' εὐαγγέλου πόλιν διή-

ἐπωδός.

κει θοὰ βάξις· εἰ δ' ἐτητύμως,

τίς οἶδεν, ἧ τοι θεῖόν ἐστι μὴ ψύθος;

460

τίς ὦδε παιδνός, ἧ φρενῶν κεκομμένος,

φλογὸς παραγγέλμασιν νέοις πυρω-

θέντα καρδίαν, ἔπειτ'

ἀλλαγᾶ λόγου καμείν;

γυναικὸς αἰχμᾶ πρέπει,

465

πρὸ τοῦ φανέντος χάριν ξυναινέσαι.

πιθανὸς ἄγαν ὁ θήλυς ὄρος ἐπινέμεται

ταχύπορος· ἀλλὰ ταχύμορον

γυναικογήρυτον ὄλλυται κλέος.

ΚΛ. τάχ' εἰσόμεσθα λαμπάδων φαεσφόρων

470

φρυκτωριῶν τε καὶ πυρὸς παραλλαγὰς,

εἴτ' οὖν ἀληθεῖς, εἴτ', ὄνειράτων δίκην,

τερπνὸν τόδ' ἐλθὼν φῶς ἐφήλωσεν φρένας.

that they are supposed to contemplate human affairs, and thus take cognizance of them. In such passages as v. 916, Prom. 356, it is not any thing physical that is inflicted by the glance of the gods or of Typhon. Jupiter's eyes may glare like lightning; but the real lightning is always hurled from his hand. Compare Soph. Ant. 127. where Jupiter's look is not made to supersede the launching of the thunderbolt in the ordinary way; Ζεὺς γὰρ μεγάλης γλώσσης κόμπους ὑπερεχθαίρει· καὶ σφας ἐσιδὼν πολλῶ ρεύματι προσνισσομένους χρυσοῦ καναχῇ χύπερ-

οπλίαις παλτῶ ρίπτει πυρὶ βαλβίδων ἐπ' ἄκρων ἤδη νίκην ὀρμῶντ' ἀλαλάξαι.—The words βάλλεται ὅσοις Διόθεν can bear no other sense naturally than 'is flashed in the eyes from Zeus.'

457. The picture contained in the words βίον κατίδοιμι must not be overlooked. 'With drooping neck,' if it does not express it, at any rate points to it.

459. The construction must be, τίς δὲ οἶδεν εἰ ἐτητύμως (διήκει) ἧτοι μὴ ἐστι θεῖον ψύθος. (and so I now find Paley gives it, at least substantially.)

Hurls in thine eyes the lightning—  
 Unenvied bliss enjoying,  
 May I ne'er be town-destroying,  
 Nor with drooping neck await the beck  
 Of another man's employing.

Now from the gladdening fire swift news is borne  
 Through all the town: but whether it be true  
 Who knows—and not perchance some god's deceit?  
 For who so childish and of reason shorn,  
 As to let his heart in rapture beat  
 At a tale when fresh and new,  
 Kindling only to be vexed  
 When the story changes next?  
 Full well it suits a woman's humour  
 Ere truth appears to spread a joyous rumour:  
 Free on the female mind to graze  
 Reports as in a common feed,  
 Then pass at will; with equal speed  
 Dies the brief fame which women blaze.

CLY. Soon shall we know of these light-bearing lamps  
 The passage of the beacons and the flame,  
 If they be true, or whether, as in dreams,  
 This pleasant light arrived has mocked our sense.

465. 'γυναικὸς αἰχμᾶ est *indoles fæminea*, ut in Choeph. 628. γυναι-  
 κείαν ἀτολμον αἰχμάν.' (Blomfield) me-  
 taphorically, like *πραπίδων οἶακα νέ-  
 μων*, v. 771.

466. Clytæmnestra had *given in*  
*her assent* to the joyful tale by com-  
 manding the sacrifices.

467. There can be no question  
 about adopting, as Paley has done,  
 the interpretation proposed by Do-  
 naldson in his *New Cratylus*: 'Too  
 credulous, the boundary of the fe-  
 male mind is readily trespassed on,  
 affording a speedy passage:' (com-

pare *πυρὶ χθὼν νέμεται* in Hom. II.  
 II. 780), nor about substituting γυ-  
 ναικογήρυτον in v. 469, from the MSS.  
 for Stephens' *γυναικοκήρυκτον*, which  
 most of the subsequent editors have  
 blindly followed.

470. *λαμπάδων φαισφόρων* is the  
 genitive denoting the general matter  
 about which something is to be  
 known; *παραλλαγὰς φρυκτ. κ. π.* the  
 special object, the thing to be known.  
 This seems better than making a  
 tautology by coupling *λαμπ. φ.* with  
*φρυκτ. τε κ. π.* as genitives after *πα-  
 ραλλαγὰς*.

κῆρυκ' ἀπ' ἀκτῆς τόνδ' ὀρώ κατάσκιον  
κλάδοις ἐλαίας· μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι κάσις 475  
πηλοῦ ξύνουρος, διψία κόνις, τάδε,  
ὥς οὔτ' ἄναυδος, οὔτε σοι δαίω φλόγα  
ὔλης ὀρείας σημανεῖ καπνῶ πυρὸς,  
ἀλλ' ἢ τὸ χαίρειν μᾶλλον ἐκβάξει λέγων—  
τὸν ἀντίον δὲ τοῖσδ' ἀποστέρῃ λόγον· 480  
εὖ γὰρ πρὸς εὖ φανεῖσι προσθήκη πέλοι.

ΧΟ. ὅστις τάδ' ἄλλως τῇδ' ἐπεύχεται πόλει,  
αὐτὸς φρενῶν καρποῖτο τὴν ἀμαρτίαν.

### ΚΗΡΥΞ.

ἰὼ πατρῶον οὔδας Ἀργείας χθονὸς,  
δεκάτῳ σε φέγγει τῷδ' ἀφικόμην ἔτους, 485  
πολλῶν ῥαγισῶν ἐλπίδων, μιᾶς τυχών.  
οὐ γάρ ποτ' ἠὔχουν τῇδ' ἐν Ἀργείᾳ χθονὶ  
θανῶν μεθέξειν φιλτάτου τάφου μέρος.  
νῦν χαῖρε μὲν χθών, χαῖρε δ' ἡλίου φάος,  
ὑπατός τε χώρας Ζεὺς, ὁ Πύθιός τ' ἄναξ, 490  
τόξοις ἰάπτων μηκέτ' εἰς ἡμᾶς βέλη·  
ἄλις παρὰ Σκάμανδρον ἦσθ' ἀνάρσιος·

477. *ἄναυδος* does not refer, as Peile thinks, to the testimony of *dust*, but, like *δαίω φλόγα*, to that of *flame*. Dindorf says “οὔτε σοι δαίω φλόγα] In his verbis vitium quoddam latet.” Why?

478. Klausen's notion that the Chorus may have fancied that the light seen by the watchman was only a spontaneous fire in a thicket, and thus had spoken of it as *θεῖον ψύθος*, *θεῖον* expressing in popular language a natural phenomenon, is ingenious, but unnecessary. *δαίω φλόγα ὔλης ὀρείας* need mean nothing more than the lighting of the fire on the Arachnæan hill by the watch-

man there, which the Chorus was slow to believe, because it did not tell them the news in so many words. So *φρυκτώρων διὰ Πεισθείσα* in v. 571.—Why should Peile call Blomfield's rendering of *καπνῶ πυρὸς*, ‘*ignis splendore*,’ ‘more spirited in itself, and more in character with the context?’ By talking in the character of the Chorus of ‘the smoke of fire’ Clytæmnestra shews her sense of the sneer, as it would be more contemptuous to speak of the flame as a mere smoke on a hill than as a bright blaze: and this would answer better to one's ordinary conceptions of what is ‘spirit-

I see a herald from the beach o'ershaded  
 With boughs of olive: witness to me here  
 Mud's friend and brother, thirsty dust, for this,  
 That now by no mute signs, no lighting up  
 Of mountain wood and smoky fire he'll speak,  
 But either by his words will spread more joy,  
 Or—but the counter thought I loathe to name—  
 For O! may good confirm what looks so well.

CHO. Whoe'er for this our state breathes other prayers,  
 In his own lap his base mind's harvest fall.

### HERALD.

Ho! Argos' soil, ground of my father-land,  
 Now in this tenth year's light I have come to thee.  
 From many a shipwrecked hope scarce rescuing one.  
 For ne'er could I have boasted I should share  
 When dead the grave I love in Argive soil—  
 Now hail, thou earth, and hail, thou light of the sun,  
 Zeus, the land's sovereign—and thou Pythian king,  
 So let thy bow shoot darts at us no more:  
 Enough on Xanthus' banks we felt thy hate,

ed,' as well as to the tone assumed by Clytæmnestra throughout, in other words, to the context.

481. 'For to what has been well begun may the accession be only Well!' Peile.

486. The passage quoted by Blomfield from Arist. Eq. 1241, seems to shew that the metaphor is not as he, Butler and the Scholiast think, from an *anchor*, but, as the passage itself appears to point out, from a *plank*. If the notion of an anchor be intended, ἑλπίς must be understood as the cable, not as the anchor itself, as the commentators strangely enough seem to imagine.

491. "ἰάπτων μηκέτ'. casting, say I, no longer," is Peile's explanation. It would surely have been simpler,

and equally accordant with the view which makes οὐ objective and μὴ subjective, to say that οὐκέτ' would have only meant 'casting no longer,' μηκέτ', 'since' or 'if he casts no longer.' In each case there is a 'say I;' but in the one the Herald would merely state a fact: in the other he connects it with what he has said before. Had οὐκέτ' been used, the line would have been a mere ornamental addition, and might possibly have been dispensed with: the use of μηκέτ' shews that it could not be taken away without dismembering the thought, and destroying the application of χαῖρε to ὁ Πύθιος ἀναξ.

492. Peile's ἦλθ involves a transition from the second to the third

νῦν δ' αὖτε σωτήρ ἴσθι καὶ παιώνιος,  
 ἄναξ Ἄπολλον. τοὺς τ' ἀγωνίους θεοὺς  
 πάντας προσαιδῶ, τόν τ' ἐμὸν τιμάορον 495  
 Ἑρμῆν, φίλον κήρυκα, κηρύκων σέβας,  
 ἥρως τε τοὺς πέμψαντας, εὐμενεῖς πάλιν  
 στρατὸν δέχεσθαι τὸν λελειμμένον δορός.  
 ἰὼ μέλαθρα βασιλέων, φίλαι στέγαι,  
 σεμνοί τε θᾶκοι, δαίμονές τ' ἀντήλιοι. 500  
 εἴ που πάλαι, φαιδροῖσι τοισίδ' ὄμμασι  
 δέξασθε κόσμῳ βασιλέα πολλῷ χρόνῳ.  
 ἦκει γὰρ ὑμῖν φῶς ἐν εὐφρόνῃ φέρων,  
 καὶ τοῖσδ' ἅπασι κοινόν, Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ.  
 ἀλλ' εὖ νιν ἀσπάσασθε, καὶ γὰρ οὖν πρέπει, 505  
 Τροίαν κατασκάψαντα τοῦ δικηφόρου  
 Διὸς μακέλλῃ, τῇ κατείργασται πέδον.  
 βωμοὶ δ' αἴιστοι καὶ θεῶν ἰδρύματα,  
 καὶ σπέρμα πάσης ἐξαπόλλυται χθονός.  
 τοιόνδε Τροία περιβαλὼν ζευκτήριον 510  
 ἄναξ Ἀτρείδης πρέσβυς, εὐδαίμων ἀνὴρ,  
 ἦκει, τίεσθαι δ' ἀξιώτατος βροτῶν  
 τῶν νῦν. Πάρις γὰρ, οὔτε συντελὴς πόλις,  
 ἐξεύχεται τὸ δρᾶμα τοῦ πάθους πλέον.

person, which he defends by supposing a similar one in vv. 495–8, a notion surely peculiar to himself, as there it is plain that the third person is used throughout. The change of ἦσθ into ἦλθες is quite as probable in itself, as the form ἦσθ may have perplexed a transcriber, and there is force rather than tameness in the repetition of ἴσθι just after. Wellauer throws out a hint that ἀνάριστος may be a gloss: but, though it would be easy to substitute ἀντίος, the supposition of a change in so important a word has not much likelihood to recommend it.

493. καὶ παιώνιος is a most happy restoration for κάπαγωνιος, and as such has rightly been received by Scholefield and Peile, though the latter on Choeph. 584 (a passage which Dindorf, after the Scholiast and Butler, though in the face of almost all modern commentators, properly refers to Pylades) appears to repent of his boldness. It is surprising that Dindorf should prefer Spanheim's κάναγωνιος, when we consider that ἀγωνίους in the next line at once convicts the old reading of tautology, and accounts for its introduction.

498. Peile apparently (see on v.

But now become to us a saviour Pæon,  
 Royal Apollo!—and the gods of games  
 All I bespeak, and him, my champion power,  
 Hermes, loved herald, honour of all heralds,  
 And the heroes who forth sent us, kindly back  
 To take the army which the lance has spared.  
 Ho! palaces of kings, beloved roofs,  
 And seats of state, and gods that front the sun!  
 If e'er before, with brightness in those eyes,  
 After long time in pomp receive your king.  
 For he is come to bring you light in darkness  
 For all alike, your monarch Agamemnon—  
 But do ye greet him gladly, for 'tis fit,  
 As having dug up Ilion with the spade  
 Of righteous Zeus, which turns o'er all the plain.  
 Crushed are the shrines and mansions of the gods,  
 And all the seed has perished from the earth—  
 So vast a yoke round Ilion having thrown,  
 The elder son of Atreus, happy man,  
 Is come, most worthy honour of all men  
 On earth: for Paris nor his partner state  
 Can boast their deeds surpass their sufferings *now*.

492) would take δέχεσθαι as put for the imperative (as in Heyne's reading of Hom. Il. I. 20, &c.): but it clearly depends on προσανδῶ.

501. The position of φαιδροῖσι shews that special stress is meant to be laid on it, as in such expressions as ἦδετο ἐπὶ πλουσίοις τοῖς πολίταις. It is scarcely correct to say with Klausen "τοισίδε δεικτικῶς de tempore, ut alibi de loco." ὅδε always means "that which I see here before me, or have now in my mind," and no advantage can be gained here by separating the notion of time from the rest, and applying it to τοισίδε. Blomfield's note is much better. "τοισίδε deorum ἀντηλίων præsentiā significat:" presence, that

is, to the eye or to the mind: after which there was no occasion to add "idemque opponi videtur τῷ πάλαι," as it only serves to confuse the sense.

509. πάσης χθονὸς may be constructed either with σπέρμα or with ἐξαπόλλυται: such expressions as πολλῶν ἐξαγισθέντας δόμων, where the order of the words is precisely the same, seem to favour the latter method.

514. The commentators have collected similar instances of the omission of οὔτε. I have been unable to find any cases of the kind in Latin: but in English it is not very uncommon: e. g. in Denham's translation of Virg. Æn. 2, "against whom

515

ὀφλὼν γὰρ ἀρπαγῆς τε καὶ κλοπῆς δίκην,  
 τοῦ ῥυσίου θ' ἤμαρτε, καὶ πανώλεθρον  
 αὐτόχθον' ὃν πατρώον ἔθρισε δόμον.  
 διπλᾶ δ' ἔτισαν Πριαμίδαί θάμάρτια.  
 ΧΟ. κήρυξ Ἀχαιῶν, χαῖρε, τῶν ἀπὸ στρατοῦ.

Tydides nor Achilles could prevail:" Gifford's Juvenal Sat. I. "Pallas nor Licinus had my estate."—*συντελής* is rightly understood by Linwood as one who is associated in the payment of any thing (rather perhaps one who makes himself an associate by contributing). In citing Suidas and Harpocration as authorities for the word as it occurs among the orators, Peile does not observe that it may very well bear the same sense here: *συντελείς* οἱ συνδαπανῶντες καὶ συνεισφέροντες τὸ δὲ πρᾶγμα συντέλεια καλεῖται. The political phraseology of the context at once fixes the meaning of the term. We have already had many political words and phrases in the play, some applied to this very matter, the quarrel of Greece against Troy, such as μέγας ἀντίδικος v. 41. *χερὶ πράκτορι* v. 111. *προδίκους Ἀτρεΐδαις* (not to anticipate the judicial scene described at the opening of Agamemnon's speech, v. 780); others with separate allusions of their own, like *μετοίκων* v. 57. *λιπόνους* v. 203. *ἄτιμος* v. 400, which plainly refers to political ἀτιμία (just as we should say that a woman in Helen's position had "lost caste"), much in the same way that Electra in Sophocles (*Elect.* 1215) asks οὕτως ἄτιμος εἰμι τοῦ τεθνηκότος; where the peculiar force of the word has been overlooked by the commentators.

516. τοῦ ῥυσίου. Of the various interpretations proposed for this word we may at once dismiss Blomfield's *liberator* (nearly coinciding with the Scholiast's τοῦ ῥύσασθαι τοὺς Τρῶας), which would

give us in τ. ρ. θ' ἤμαρτε a clause not well expressed in itself, and not cohering well with the clause that follows, as the structure of the passages evidently shews two distinct notions to be intended, which are afterwards spoken of as διπλᾶ θάμάρτια. These are clearly enough given by the explanation of Klausen, Peile, Dindorf, Linwood, &c., noticed also by Blomfield, which makes the words mean 'he has at once lost his prize, and ruined his country,'—supposing ῥυσίου to be taken either in the original sense of any thing dragged off, or in a transferred sense from that of a thing taken in pledge till the real object of litigation be restored; for it is obvious that Æschylus could never have dreamed of this stricter meaning of ῥύσιον, as he nowhere represents the act of Paris as one of retaliation. A forensic sense however is recommended by the context: and this we get from Scholefield's rendering, a pledge in the sense of gage or caution-money deposited by the parties before the trial of a suit. This pledge can hardly be Helen herself, as Æschylus knew nothing of the story of her being detained by Proteus: it must then allude not to any thing definite or tangible, but to that which, supposing the quarrel to have been decided at law instead of by arms, he would have had to forfeit. How much this would have been, is of course undecided, except by the practical verdict of the sword, which in stripping him of it stripped him of all that he had, his father's house and his



For he, cast in the suit for rape and theft,  
Has forfeited his pledge, and all to ruin  
Mowed down his father's mansion to the ground,  
While Priam's sons have paid their debt twice o'er.  
CHO. Hail, herald of the Greeks, those of the host !

country. And it is to this massing up of the legal *ῥύσιον* into the rough estimate which from the nature of the case had to be given, that the last line of the speech refers, 'and the price which the people of Priam have had to pay for their sins is double;' not that this is meant as a summing up of what had gone before:—on the contrary, the two parties, Paris and the state, are separately dealt with, the one in vv. 515–7, the other in v. 518:—but that the treatment of the one corresponds to that of the other, each having had the strict equivalent for the offence committed swallowed up in the heavy vengeance which was eventually exacted.

517. Peile does not seem to understand the objection which Blomfield and the succeeding editors have made to *αὐτόχθονον*, which is not simply that it does not occur, but that it is not the natural derivative from *χθών*, as he accumulates instances like *αὐτότοκος*, *αὐτόκωπος*, which being regularly formed are nothing to the purpose, and supposes that Butler, in saying "*αὐτόχθονος nulla analogia defendi potest*" means merely "*nulla auctoritate.*" It will hardly be contended that *αὐτόχθων* having already a meaning of its own, it was necessary to invent a new word *αὐτόχθονος* to express the same as *σὺν αὐτῇ χθονὶ*, as *αὐτότοκος* for instance might mean 'self-produced' (it actually does occur paroxytone in an active sense) beside being equivalent to *σὺν αὐτῷ τόκῳ*, and in the present case the two meanings are mere variations of the general one 'connected

with the very soil.' It is however scarcely necessary to take *αὐτόχθονα* here in any other sense than 'down to the ground,' which is a sufficiently strong expression, and much more proper than any notion about sweeping 'away land and all.' The possessive *ὁς* is not usual, certainly, and in an ordinary case might be called inelegant, though it is rather a strange argument against it to adduce passages where it does not occur; here however it is useful, serving to mark off *πανώλεθρον* and *αὐτόχθονα* from *πατρῶον δόμον*, with which they might otherwise have been construed, and refer them to *ἔθρισε*, which they thus strengthen and intensify. Another instance of the position of an epithet indicating the stress which is to be laid upon it has been noticed already on v. 501, *φαιδροῖσι τοισίδ' ὄμμασι*. There is a similar case in Suppl. 9, *ἀλλ' αὐτογενῇ τὸν φυξάνορα γάμον Αἰγύπτου παίδων ἀσεβῇ τ' ὀνοταζόμεναι*, where not understanding that *αὐτογενῇ*, like *ἀσεβῇ*, is to be taken in close connection with *ὀνοταζόμεναι*, as specifying what it was in the marriage which the Danaides abhorred, its consanguinity and consequent impiety, recent commentators (Paley I have not seen) "in alia omnia abierunt." Linwood (Lexicon v. *ὀνοτάζω*) seems to see the right view of the passage, though there he questions its integrity, and elsewhere, on this very ground of the position of the article, pronounces it to be corrupt.

519. *τῶν ἀπὸ στρατοῦ* may be understood like *στρατὸν*—*τὸν λελειμμένον δορός* v. 498, "those who are left



ΚΗ. χαίρω· τεθνᾶναι δ' οὐκ ἔτ' ἀντερῶ θεοῖς.

520

ΧΟ. ἔρως πατρώας τῆσδε γῆς σ' ἐγύμνασεν;

ΚΗ. ὥστ' ἐνδακρύειν γ' ὄμμασιν χαρᾶς ὕπο.

ΧΟ. τερπνῆς ἄρ' ἦτε τῆσδ' ἐπήβολοι νόσου.

ΚΗ. πῶς δὴ διδαχθεὶς τοῦδε δεσπόσω λόγου;

ΧΟ. τῶν ἀντερόντων ἱμέρῳ πεπληγμένος.

525

ΚΗ. ποθεῖν ποθοῦντα τήνδε γῆν στρατὸν λέγεις;

ΧΟ. ὥς πόλλ' ἀμαυρᾶς ἐκ φρενός μ' ἀναστένειν.

ΚΗ. πόθεν τὸ δύσφρον τοῦτ' ἐπῆν στύγος στρατῶ;

ΧΟ. πάλαι τὸ σιγαῖν φάρμακον βλάβης ἔχω.

ΚΗ. καὶ πῶς; ἀπόντων κοιράνων ἔτρεις τινάς;

530

of the army,' or it may be simply 'those of the army,' 'those who come from the army, not of course from their being any deputation, but from the army being regarded as a class, so that its members might be said to be ἀπὸ στρατοῦ, while those at home were οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς ἄλλης Ἑλλάδος.

524. "Translate, How, I pray you, informed shall I be master of this saying? i. e. what information must I first receive in order to comprehend your meaning? To this virtual question the direct answer is, 'the information contained in these four words, τῶν ἀντερόντων ἱμέρῳ πεπληγμένος:' which however we may go on to translate, In that you were smitten with a love for them that loved in turn: the construction being in fact διδαχθεὶς πεπληγμένος, i. e. διδαχθεὶς σε πεπληῆχθαι." Peile.

528. "The Chorus had been expressing its grief at the absence of the army, which grief arose from a feeling as well of their danger abroad as of the evil produced thereby at home; and hence they regarded the expedition with feelings of disgust. The Chorus having thus strongly expressed their *mournful anxiety* for its return, the Herald imagines that there is some reason for this, and

asks, Whence did this gloomy feeling of dislike attach to the army? The aversion here expressed was felt to the army not *as men*, but as the abettors of a cause which had produced and was likely to produce such mischief." So Linwood, who says this is Klausen's interpretation; but he scarcely even alludes to what Klausen evidently considers the main point, the matter on which the Chorus had to keep silence, 'metum ne quid insidiarum pararetur regibus.' In any case however such an explanation is most improbable: the Herald was not likely to divine that the Chorus disliked the army in any way, for the very reason that the dislike, in Linwood's sense, was only by implication, so that had he known enough to take such a recondite view, and to see that the army could be disliked at all, he must have known more than he evidently does of the cause of such a feeling. To have been able to reason as Klausen does, he must have had Klausen's knowledge of the real state of things. A more natural interpretation of the passage according to the old punctuation would be, 'Whence came this hateful feeling to lie upon the army?'—meaning, 'How came you to en-

HER. I take it: now come death when heaven shall will!

CHO. Thou hast then been trained by love for this thy land?

HER. Aye, so that tears flow from my eyes for joy.

CHO. This sweet contagion then affected you?

HER. How must I learn to master thy intent?

CHO. Learning that those thou lov'dst did love thee back.

HER. What, that the land we longed for longed for us?

CHO. Aye, so that oft I groaned from gloom of soul.

HER. Whence came these saddening thoughts linked with the host?

CHO. Silence I long have found a sovereign balm.

HER. How? fearedst thou any when the kings were gone?

certain such a hateful feeling in connection with the army?' The connection of thought would be this: 'I can understand your saying that you longed for us as much as we longed for you:—that, as you just expressed it, is a *τερπνὴ νόσος*; but when you come to speak of groaning from the gloom of your soul, I begin to be perplexed: the feeling is evidently something more, a *δύσφρον στύγος* (either 'a saddening hateful feeling,' *στύγος* passive, or, if it be active, 'a feeling of dark discontent,' not with the army, but with the state of things to which they were left): and whence could such a feeling in your mind overlaid the thought of the army?' Thus the whole line is to be understood with reference to the mind of the Chorus, and in this view may be compared with vv. 90 sqq.:—the *δύσφρον στύγος* being a feeling which overlaid the thought of the army, so that the latter could not be touched without exciting the former. The metaphor is not more harsh than several of those in the Chorus beginning v. 944: and to speak of a thought as a physical depression is by no means strange. This explanation may seem not unlike Linwood's: but on consideration it will

be seen that it avoids the objections which have been urged against his by making *δύσφρον στύγος* an exact parallel to *τερπνὴ νόσος*, and by entirely rejecting the notion that the Chorus could, even by implication, be supposed by the Herald to dislike the army. Blomfield's punctuation is not a natural one, any more than Haupt's suggestion to make an interrogation after *τοῦτ'*: Emper's (or rather Schutz's) suggestion that *στρατῶ* is a gloss, is in the last degree hazardous: and Wellauer and Scholefield's fancy that *στρατὸς* in such a connection as this can possibly mean *the people* (the people minus the real army!) is refuted in a few lines by Klausen, and indeed refutes itself.

530. Peile is right in adopting Scholefield's punctuation, of which he observes, "an emphasis is thus thrown upon *ἔτρεῖς τινάς*;—and with this agrees the reply in v. 531, much better than with the question *καὶ πῶς ἔτρεῖς*;" This will yet further appear, if we supply what must be supplied to complete the sense. Χο. *πάλαί τὸ σιγᾶν φάρμακον βλάβης ἔχω. Κη. καὶ πῶς (ἂν γένοιτο ταῦτα); ἀπόντων κοιράνων ἔτρεῖς τινάς*; (the thought strikes him as the only one which will account for the remark

ΧΟ. ὥς νῦν τὸ σὸν δὴ, καὶ θανεῖν πολλὴ χάρις.

ΚΗ. εὖ γὰρ πέπρακται. ταῦτα δ' ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ

τὰ μὲν τις εὖ λέξειεν εὐπετῶς ἔχειν,

τὰ δ' αὖτε κἀπίμομφα. τίς δέ, πλὴν θεῶν,

ἅπαντ' ἀπήμων τὸν δι' αἰῶνος χρόνον;

535

μόχθους γὰρ εἰ λέγοιμι καὶ δυσανλίας,

σπαρνὰς παρήξεις καὶ κακοστρώτους,—τί δ' αὖ

στένοντες; οὐ λαχόντες ἡματος μέρος;

τὰ δ' αὖτε χέρσῳ καὶ προσῆν, πλεόν στύγος·

εὐναὶ γὰρ ἦσαν δηῖων πρὸς τείχεσιν·

540

ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γὰρ κἀπὸ γῆς λειμώνια

δρόσοι κατεψέκαζον, ἔμπεδον σίνος

ἐσθημάτων, τιθέντες ἔνθηρον τρίχα.

χειμῶνα δ' εἰ λέγοι τις οἰωνοκτόνον,

οἶον παρείχ' ἄφερτον Ἰδαία χιῶν,

545

ἢ θάλπος, εὔτε πόντος ἐν μεσημβριναῖς

κοίταις ἀκύμων νηνέμοις εὔδοι πεσὼν—

τί ταῦτα πενθεῖν δεῖ; παροίχεται πόνος·

παροίχεται δέ, τοῖσι μὲν τεθνηκόσιν

of the Chorus; but he can hardly believe it, so he puts it as a question: whereas the old reading would imply that he had no doubt of the fact, but only questioned how it came to pass: a supposition not nearly so natural, as the fact was extraordinary in itself, and had not been expressly stated by the Chorus.) Χο. ὥς νῦν τὸ σὸν δὴ, an answer to the first question, καὶ πῶς ἂν γένοιτο ταῦτα; for the second was far too direct to be answered safely. ὥς clearly answers to πῶς: an additional reason for the new punctuation, as the comparison is not so precise between the fear of the Chorus and the Herald's feeling as between the more general sorrow of the Chorus and the longing of the Herald.—καὶ θανεῖν πολλὴ χάρις may be construed as Peile construes it,

as an epexegetis of τὸ σὸν, “even death had been a matter of much thankfulness:” or we may take καὶ as a copulative, and render the whole line, ‘Why, it was with us as thou just now saidst for thyself, and we should have been most thankful for death.’ δὴ Peile renders ‘in very deed:’ its force is rather that of pointing with somewhat more or less of impatience to a thing as already fixed: ‘that you told us just now:’ in the same way as καὶ δὴ· καὶ δὴ τεθνᾶσι· ‘Well, suppose them to be dead: that is settled: what follows?’

533. τὰ μὲν τις εὖ λέξειεν. *partim laudes*. Klausen: who adds “εὖ λέγειν cf. v. 409 (430). Ex hoc sumenda est sola dicendi notio in alteram sententiæ partem:” but this is unnecessary, not to say harsh, with

CHO. Why, even as now thou saidst, to die were gain.

HER. Yea, for 'tis well. Here as in length of time  
Some things a man would say gave cause for thanks,  
And others for complaint: but who save heaven  
May pass through his whole life exempt from pain?  
Why, should I tell our labours and bad lodgement,  
Scant landings and vile beds—what had we not  
To wail, what not to take as our day's portion?  
Then too our dry-land hardships, a worse harm—  
Our beds were set beside the enemies' walls,  
And out of heaven and from the earth the dews  
Dropped on the meadows, a close-clinging curse  
On our attire, making our hair like beasts'.  
Then, should one tell the winter, death to birds,  
How hard to bear the snow of Ida made it—  
Or the great heat when in his midday couch  
Windless and waveless Ocean sunk to sleep—  
Why need one grieve for this? the labour's *past*,  
Aye, and so past, that those who are in their graves

εὐπετῶς ἔχειν following, while the subsequent divorce of λέγειν from εὖ is very unnatural. It is better surely to take them as separate from the first, and render εὖ 'rightly' (which I now see Paley has done). With regard to the optative without ἄν, see on v. 308.

537. τί δ' οὐ. *quid est quod non quereremur, quid quod non experti simus diei sortem?* Klausen: who apparently has the merit of having been the first to point out the true construction. τί used to be joined with ἡματος μέρος, and construed 'during what part of the day:' and thus it became difficult to know what to do with λαχόντες. Most thought it corrupt, Stanley reading κλαίοντες, Heath λακόντες, Schutz οὐ λαχόντες: others tried to explain it, Casaubon putting a new sense on the word itself, 'aut non sortiremur,

nempe ad obeundas vigilandi et remigandi stationes,' Abresch and Wellauer trying to explain the whole passage as involved, the former giving as its equivalent, τι δ' οὐ μέρος ἡμέρας ἐλάχομεν οὐ στένοντες, where the first οὐ would surely be redundant, the latter rendering, 'qua parte diei non suspiravimus, quum illa nobis non acciderint,' which would rather require μὴ λαχόντες, as Linwood remarks, though he, strangely enough, passes over Klausen's interpretation altogether, and fancies λάσκοντες may be the true reading.

540. γὰρ in duabus sententiis unam priorem duplici ratione respiciens vide v. 698, 701. (731-4) Wellauer.

543. δρόσοι—τιθέντες. See on vv. 118. 139.

τὸ μήποτ' αὖθις μηδ' ἀναστῆναι μέλειν. 550  
 τί τοὺς ἀναλωθέντας ἐν ψήφῳ λέγειν,  
 τὸν ζῶντα δ' ἀλγεῖν χρὴ τύχης παλιγκότου ;  
 καὶ πολλὰ χαίρειν ξυμφοραῖς καταξιῶ.  
 ἡμῖν δὲ τοῖς λοιποῖσιν Ἀργείων στρατοῦ  
 νικᾷ τὸ κέρδος, πῆμα δ' οὐκ ἀντιρρέπει. 555  
 ὥς κομπάσαι τῷδ' εἰκὸς ἡλίου φάει  
 ὑπὲρ θαλάσσης καὶ χθονὸς ποτωμένοις.  
 Τροίαν ἐλόντες δήποτ', Ἀργείων στόλος  
 θεοῖς λάφυρα ταῦτα τοῖς καθ' Ἑλλάδα  
 δόμοις ἐπασσάλευσαν ἀρχαῖον γάνος. 560  
 τοιαῦτα χρὴ κλύοντας εὐλογεῖν πόλιν  
 καὶ τοὺς στρατηγούς· καὶ χάρις τιμήσεται  
 Διὸς τάδ' ἐκπράξασα. πάντ' ἔχεις λόγον.

553. Haupt's translation, "atque maximopere fortuna delectari opus censeo," and Bothe's "immo dignas has fortunas censeo, quibus multum lætemur," which Klausen in his summary, "lætandum est de iis quæ sibi acciderint," seems to follow, are less bad indeed than the construing "I think there are many things to rejoice at in our misfortunes," but cannot stand against the interpretation which has been generally received at least since Blomfield's edition, 'and I award to misfortune a long farewell.' The accusative, as Blomfield remarks, occurs more frequently in such formulas, as in Eurip. Hipp. 112. τὴν σὴν δὲ Κύπριν πολλ' ἐγὼ χαίρειν λέγω : but as ξυμφορὰς can be supplied after πολλὰ χαίρειν, the two expressions of course come to the same thing. If Κύπριν be held to be governed by λέγω, the difference will merely be that in the one case πολλὰ χαίρειν would be said *of*, in the other said *to* the party whom the phrase is intended to dismiss. Paley I see maintains Haupt's and Bothe's trans-

lations to be right, and calls the common interpretation 'falsissima,' but without saying why. Even were it as false as he asserts it to be, it would still be a sufficient reason against the other translation, that the lines following, ἡμῖν δὲ κ. τ. λ. which from the way in which they are introduced evidently convey a new thought, would then be a mere tautology.

557. "ποτωμένοις is here a figurative flying, in which the herald is made to represent himself and his comrades, the conquerors of Troy, flying over sea and land, and, as they go, proclaiming what follows, Τροίαν ἐλόντες, &c." Symmons.

559. γάνος is one of those words which makes us wish that we had a Lexilogus for Æschylus, like Buttmann's for Homer. At present one can only ascertain that it means something bright and joyous (notions constantly connected in Greek, as in the case of φαῖδρος, χαροπός, &c.), and thus is peculiarly applicable to any sparkling liquid. Such words as γαίω, γαῦρος, γαλήνη, γάλα,

Care now for nought—not e'en for rising up.  
 Why should we count the number of the lost,  
 Or groan, now spared ourselves, for adverse chance?  
 No—I would bid a long farewell to woe.  
 For us, the remnant of the Argive host,  
 Joy conquers, nor can sorrow weigh it down.  
 So that we well may boast to this sunlight,  
 Still crying as we fly o'er land and main:  
 Masters of Troy in sooth, the Argive band  
 These spoils in offering to the gods of Greece  
 Have fastened to their shrines, an antique boast.  
 This when they hear, men needs must praise the state  
 And our commanders, honouring too the grace  
 Of Zeus, which wrought all this.—My say is said.

γέλαω, ἄγανός, ἀγάλλομαι, are evidently kindred to it, as Liddell and Scott remark. It is generally understood to mean a thing which gives joy: but there seems no reason why it should not be taken as any thing which is *itself* smiling, joyous, or glittering. Thus it will here express the bright sunny look of the arms. Those who adopt this notion may read in my translation “antique gem” (which are Peile’s words, though he merely uses them as synonymous with “ornament” or “embellishment”) instead of “antique boast.” Peile rightly supplies in his rendering “to be” before ἀρχ. γ., which shews the sense to be “for our posterity to regard as a glory of olden time,” and avoids the necessity of supposing ἀρχαῖον to refer either to the *ancient pieces* contained in the spoils, or to the antiquity of the custom of giving spoils to the gods (Klausen), or of reading ἀρχαίοις with Porson, Blomfield, and Dindorf, and thus leaving γάνος

without an epithet. δόμοις naturally goes with ἐπασσάλευσαν: θεοῖς is *for* the gods: τοῖς καθ’ Ἑλλάδα may be taken with either of the two datives, the construction with the latter being recommended by such expressions as τοὺς πολιισούχους θεοὺς, while that with the former gives more dignity to the whole thought, representing the same thing as being done throughout Greece which the herald was then doing in Argos.

560. None of the commentators seem to have thought it worth while to remark what is intended by τοιαῦτα, and who by κλύοντας. At first sight it is obvious to suppose that the Herald is addressing the Chorus, “Now that you have heard this, it is meet for you to congratulate the state and the commanders.” The sense given in Symmons’ version is however greatly to be preferred, as cohering naturally with what goes before, and making a much more spirited conclusion:

As such sounds spread abroad, the listening world  
 Must needs our chiefs admire, our city laud,  
 And honour will be paid to Jove, whose grace  
 These deeds accomplished. Thou hast heard me out.

- ΧΟ. νικώμενος λόγοισιν οὐκ ἀναίνομαι·  
 αἰεὶ γὰρ ἤβᾶ τοῖς γερούσιν εὖ μαθεῖν. 565  
 δόμοις δὲ ταῦτα καὶ Κλυταιμνήστρα μέλειν  
 εἰκὸς μάλιστα, σὺν δὲ πλουτίζειν ἐμέ.
- ΚΛ. ἀνωλόλυξα μὲν πάλαι χαρᾶς ὕπο,  
 ὅτ' ἦλθ' ὁ πρῶτος νύχιος ἄγγελος πυρὸς,  
 φράζων ἄλωσιν Ἰλίου τ' ἀνάστασιν. 570  
 καὶ τίς μ' ἐνίπτων εἶπε, Φρυκτώρων διὰ  
 πεισθεῖσα, Τροίαν νῦν πεπορθῆσθαι δοκεῖς ;  
 ἢ κάρτα πρὸς γυναικὸς, αἵρεσθαι κέαρ.  
 λόγοις τοιούτοις πλαγκτὸς οὖσ' ἐφαινόμην·  
 ὅμως δ' ἔθνον· καὶ γυναικείῳ νόμῳ 575  
 ὀλολυγμὸν ἄλλος ἄλλοθεν κατὰ πτόλιν  
 ἔλασκον, εὐφημοῦντες ἐν θεῶν ἔδραις  
 θηφάγον κοιμῶντες εὐώδη φλόγα.  
 καὶ νῦν τὰ μάσσῳ μὲν τί δεῖ σ' ἐμοὶ λέγειν ;  
 ἄνακτος αὐτοῦ πάντα πεύσομαι λόγον. 580  
 ὅπως δ' ἄριστα τὸν ἐμὸν αἰδοῖον πόσιν  
 σπεύσω πάλιν μολόντα δέξασθαι. τί γὰρ  
 γυναικὶ τούτου φέγγος ἥδιον δρακεῖν,  
 ἀπὸ στρατείας ἄνδρα σώσαντος θεοῦ,  
 πύλας ἀνοίξαι ; ταῦτ' ἀπάγγελον πόσει· 585  
 ἦκειν ὅπως τάχιστ', ἐράσμιον πόλει,  
 γυναῖκα πιστὴν δ' ἐν δόμοις εὖροι μολῶν,

564. “ νικώμενος participium per attractionem positum pro infinitivo, ut θανούσα δ' οὐκ ἀναίνομαι pro θανεῖν Eur. Iph. Aul. 1502.” Abresch (quoted by Klausen). Sewell erroneously renders “ Though conquered by thy words, I cry not hold,” supposing that ἀναίνομαι can be construed like ἀπείπον, ἀπείρηκα, &c.

565. Symmons' translation “ for thus old men have their bloom, wisdom, and prudence, and inquiry sage,” is refuted by αἰεὶ, which de-

termines the sense to be “ it is never too late.”

567. “ πλουτίζειν. divitem et beatum reddere. Cf. v. 1188 (1235). Schol. μεταδιδόναι μοι τῆς χαρᾶς. Subiecti accusativus est ταῦτα, ut illo etiam loco res quædam divitem reddunt, non personæ.” Klausen.

575. νόμῳ. *cantilena sacra*. Blomfield. *ritu*. Haupt. Linwood. *jussu*. Klausen. Symmons. The two first interpretations seem objectionable, as compelling us to suppose



CHO. Thy words have conquered, gladly I confess,  
 For age is ever young enough to learn—  
 But the whole house, and Clytæmnestra most,  
 The news should touch, while it enriches me.

CLY. Long since I set a shout up in my joy,  
 When the first nightly messenger of fire  
 Came, telling of Troy's capture and o'erturn.  
 One chid me then and said—Could beacon lights  
 Persuade thee to believe that Troy is fallen?  
 Most like a woman, thus to be puffed up!—  
 Such talking made me waver, as it seemed:  
 Yet still I sacrificed; and through the town,  
 Though woman bade, they shouted here and there  
 With loud acclaim, as in the gods' abodes  
 They lulled to sleep the fragrant spice-fed flame.  
 And now, what need for thee to tell me more?  
 I from the king himself will learn the whole.  
 But I will think how best I may receive  
 My honoured lord returning. For what light  
 More welcome to a woman's eyes than this,  
 When heaven sends back her husband from the wars,  
 To open him the gates? go, tell my lord,  
 To come at his best speed, desired by all;  
 So would he find at home a faithful wife,

that the ὀλολυγμός was one of women, whereas the masculines in the succeeding lines would rather imply the contrary. For νόμος in the sense of an edict Klausen refers to Soph. Ant. 382. 481. γυναικείῳ then will here be equivalent to ἐμῷ, expressing in addition a sneer, like πρὸς γυναικὸς two lines above; a sense which is well given by Klausen, "voluntati meæ obtemperabant Argivi, quamvis nonnulli me reprehenderant."

577. "Locus est intelligendus de acclamationibus in fine sacrificii." Butler.

584. By striking out the comma

after ἄνδρα with Porson's ed. of 1806, Klausen, and Peile, we avoid the necessity of reading ἀνδρὶ with Blomfield and Dindorf (after Voss and Stanley, who also read ἡ' πο στρατείας), or inserting τ' before ἀνοίξαι to couple it with δρακεῖν, as Pauw and Schutz have done. Klausen rightly takes ἀνοίξαι as belonging to a clause in apposition with τοῦτον (which would have been more fully expressed by τοῦ ἀνοίξαι), instead of supposing an ellipse of ἡ. So ἀμαρτεῖν in Eur. Alc. 879 (900) is equivalent to τοῦ ἀμαρτεῖν.

587. Peile's explanation of εὔραι,



οἶαν περ οὖν ἔλειπε, δωμάτων κύνα  
 ἐσθλὴν ἐκείνῳ, πολεμίαν τοῖς δύσφροσιν,  
 καὶ τᾶλλ' ὁμοίαν πάντα, σημαντήριον  
 οὐδὲν διαφθείρασαν ἐν μήκει χρόνου.  
 οὐκ οἶδα τέρψιν οὐδ' ἐπίψογον φάτιν  
 ἄλλου πρὸς ἀνδρὸς μᾶλλον ἢ χαλκοῦ βαφάς.

590

ΚΗ. τοιόσδ' ὁ κόμπος, τῆς ἀληθείας γέμων,  
 οὐκ αἰσχροὺς ὥς γυναικὶ γενναία λακεῖν.

595

ΧΟ. αὕτη μὲν οὕτως εἶπε μανθάνοντί σοι  
 τοροῖσιν ἐρμηνεύσιν εὐπρεπῶς λόγον.  
 σὺ δ' εἶπες, κήρυξ, Μενέλεων δὲ πεύθομαι,  
 εἰ νόστιμός γε καὶ σεσωσμένος πάλιν  
 ἦξει σὺν ὑμῖν, τῇσδε γῆς φίλον κράτος.

600

after Matthiæ, Gr. Gr. §. 529, 3, is sufficiently supported by the passage quoted from Soph. Phil. 617. The use of the optative in the oratio obliqua coincides with the view given on v. 308, which shews that the optative regards things hypothetically and subjectively, and so naturally comes in whenever a thing is asserted as part of the speech or as the opinion of any one. Paley objects that this explanation would introduce a solecism, as the optative cannot be used except in the case of a thing past, which is the case in the passage from the Philoctetes. The question however really is, whether there is any thing in the notion of the Greek optative which would make it unsuitable in this place. *εὖροι μολὼν* I should construe, "he would find, I think, if he came:" where the optative, like the English *would*, has a sense partaking indeed of the notion of the past, but by no means inappropriate here. As a general rule, a mood with a past sense will not be used except about a past event: cases however may occur where a past aspect may be taken

in a present or even a future matter: and there the occurrence of the optative ought not to surprise us.

590. Symmons, and Klausen after him, are right in taking *σημαντήριον* for the seal placed on the king's effects during his absence, against the Scholiast, Schutz, and Blomfield, who think it is the seal of constancy, though the limiting *οὐδὲν* would be no objection to this last interpretation, as it might be taken like *μάντιν οὐτινα ψέγων* v. 179. Peile strangely supposes that *οὐδὲν* may include both senses, as if she had said, "I have broken no seal, either literally or metaphorically."

592. "*ἐπίψογον φάτιν*, reprehentem famam, malam famam: Nemo quidquam mihi" (surely rather *in me*) "dixit de ullo viro alio, cujus ratione me reprehenderet." Klausen. It is possible however that *φάτις* may have the sense of *τὸ φατιζόμενον*, which is frequently the case with such words, as there will be occasion to notice on v. 1530. This would make it correspond better with *τέρψιν*, and render the sense of *ἄλλου πρὸς ἀνδρὸς*, which at first sight

Just as he left her, watchdog of his house,  
To him all kindness, to his foes a foe,  
And for the rest unaltered, having broken  
No single seal through all this length of time.  
Nought have I known of pleasure nor ill fame  
From other man, more than of dying brass.

HER. A boast like this, full charged with truth within,  
Is no unmeet one for a noble dame.

CHO. Aye, thus has she rehearsed to thee who learnest  
By clear interpreters a goodly speech.  
But Herald, say—I ask of Menelaus,  
Will he returning and preserved in safety  
Arrive with you, dear sovereign of this land?

seems to mean “spread by another man,” less ambiguous.

593. χαλκοῦ βαφὰς is fully as ambiguous as κρόκου βαφὰς in v. 228. It seems however plain that Abresch is right in making it equivalent to “rem quæ fieri nequit,” though his distinction between the στόμωσις of brass and iron is probably contrary to fact (see the authorities quoted by Blomfield, which appear to have so far convinced Bothe, that he supposes the words, absurdly enough, to be said aside, the sense being “no more than—the commonest practice”), and certainly contradicted by the Scholiast, who explains χαλκοῦ by σιδήρου. Not very probable is Welcker’s supposition, adopted by Klausen, that the dying of brass was a recent invention and consequently not generally known, as if a modern dramatic writer were to make one of his characters say “I know no more of it than of working the Daguerreotype.” The obvious interpretation is that of Butler and Symmons, which Peile seems to follow:—that which refers to the impossibility of making brass, or any metal, imbibe colour like wool. The ancients used indeed to paint

their statues: but such tinting is very different from dying.

590. I believe the construction given by the Scholiast is the true one, οὕτως εἶπεν ἀκριβέσι λόγοις καὶ ἐξηγητικοῖς ὥστε σε μαθεῖν, though I see no occasion to read λόγοις with Blomfield. The “clear interpreters” are doubtless *words*, but there is no reason for expressing λόγοις, whereas λόγον can very well follow εἶπε in the sense of *oratio*. And so Wel-lauer and Bernhardt (Synt. p. 128) seem to take it, though Klausen says “At interpres est homo, non vox,” as if words could not be called interpreters of thought, even though there were no such authority for the expression as Horace’s *Post effert animi motus interprete lingua!* —Klausen’s τοιοῖσιν ἐρμηνεύσιν εὐ-πρεπῶς, adopted by Paley, though admissible, would be rather a cumbersome equivalent for ὥσπερ ἐρμηνεύς τορός. Peile rightly observes, “αὕτη μὲν οὕτως belongs to a summary form of words, by which Æschylus loves to dismiss one subject, whether person or thing, and pass on to another;” but as this dismissal clearly extends in the present case over two lines, that is no argument

ΚΗ. οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως λέξαιμι τὰ ψευδῇ καλὰ  
 ἐς τὸν πολὺν φίλοισι καρποῦσθαι χρόνον.

ΧΟ. πῶς δῆτ' ἂν εἰπὼν κεδνὰ τ' ἀληθῇ τύχοις ;  
 σχισθέντα δ' οὐκ εὐκρυπτα γίγνεται τάδε.

ΚΗ. ἀνὴρ ἄφαντος ἐξ Ἀχαικοῦ στρατοῦ,  
 αὐτός τε καὶ τὸ πλοῖον· οὐ ψευδῇ λέγω.

605

against *εὐπρεπῶς* being taken with *οὕτως* as further explaining what the Chorus means to say, and *λόγον* with *εἶπε*. It would be a waste of such a word as *εὐπρεπῶς* to construe it with *μανθανόντι*, when it so evidently expresses the notion of a fair set speech. Whether the Chorus really knows of Clytæmnestra's guilt or no (a question which it is difficult to determine, as they appear to be smitten with a spirit of involuntary prediction, and scarcely to be conscious of what they say themselves, e. g. in v. 147, sqq., compared with the ignorance displayed in the scene with Cassandra), it is plain her speech gives them the impression which her subsequent address gives to Agamemnon, that she has studied

her part for the approaching ceremonial, and delivers herself accordingly.

601. οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως λέξαιμι. The older commentators, with all their antipathy to the optative without *ἂν*, do not seem to have found fault with constructions like this, from a consciousness probably that *ἔστι* or *οὐκ ἔστι* could not make the difference, but that they would then have to alter all the cases where *ὅπως*, *ὥς*, &c. are used alone with an optative. Burges is a solitary exception, having in his note on Prom. 291, where he very ingeniously alters *μείζονα μοῖραν* to *μείζον' ἂν ὦραν*, given a list of offending passages, with most of which he deals then and there\*. The present passage fares very ill,

\* Perhaps I may be allowed, now that I am on the subject, to say something on one of the passages adduced as containing a similar construction, Choeph. 172. οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις πλὴν ἐμοῦ κείραιτό νιν, in defence, not of the language, but of the sense, which most of the recent annotators have misunderstood, and have thus been led to alter the text. So long as *κείραιτό νιν* was taken "could have cut off this lock of hair," it was natural that the line should be thought absurd as it stands, as Electra would never say, "No one but myself could have cut off *this particular* lock:" but it is strange that Linwood, who sees that *κείρεσθαι* is equivalent to *πενθῆσαι τριχί* in the next line, and that *νιν* is Agamemnon, should approve Dobree's correction, *ἐνδς* for *ἐμοῦ*, which really spoils the sense. Take the whole passage as it stands, and the meaning will be plain. Electra is gradually unfolding to the Chorus the process of thought by which she arrives at the conclusion that the hair has been sent by Orestes. She begins by laying down the position, "There is no one (here) except myself who would be likely to honour him by an offering of hair." The Chorus acquiesces, observing that those from whom it was to be expected happen to be his enemies (an answer which fixes the sense of *κείραιτό νιν*, for if the point of Electra's position had been an argument from the particular lock, its colour and so forth, and not from the general fact of showing respect by cutting off hair, such a reply would have been utterly wide of the mark). Electra then advances another step—"And yet, though we have excluded all the people here, who are the only persons that can be supposed to have access to the spot, there is a fact which seems to fix it: the appearance of the lock is like"—The Chorus asks, "Whose hair?" She replies, "My own:" from which they naturally infer that it must have come from Orestes, whose hair was known to be like hers. Thus all is plain and natural: whereas, if we were to read *ἐνδς*, we should have Electra announcing her conclusion at once, the Chorus apparently understanding her,

HER. I cannot make by talking false words good

For friends to reap the fruit of them for long.

CHO. How canst thou then give pleasure and speak truth?

'Tis all too plain the two are separate here.

HER. The man is vanished from the Achæan host,

Himself and vessel: I have told thee truth.

having ἄν obtruded upon it at the end of the line, καλ' ἄν. It would have been much better to have proposed λέξαιμ' ἄν ἀψευδῇ καλὰ, "I cannot tell you of good fortune without falsehood." \* — Of course however there is no occasion for any change of language or sense. What is the real effect of ἄν upon the optative is a very difficult question: Peile can scarcely be held to have settled it with his "in any conceivable case" and "under certain circumstances," though it is undoubtedly something to have attempted it. I can only repeat the remark made on v. 308, that there are very few, if any, passages where both constructions would not be admissible, as it is but seldom that the mind is so accurate in its position of contingency as not to allow of the shade being a little varied if necessary. The probability seems to be, that the contingency is a little less naked with ἄν than without, as the discussion which has recently taken place in the *Classical Museum*, vols. II. IV. tends to prove. — With regard to the sense of the passage before us, the position of κενὰ in v. 603 shows that καλὰ here is to be taken with λέξαιμι, instead of being, as is generally supposed, a substantive of which ψευδῇ is the epithet.—The sense then is,

"I cannot speak falsehood into good," "I cannot give falsehood a good appearance," for a permanency, that is, as the next line explains. The Chorus then asks, "If you cannot do this, how can you be so fortunate as to speak truth into prosperity?" i. e. to combine the two in your speech; a line which has been equally mistaken, Schutz and Butler wishing to read καληθῇ, while others suppose τὰληθῇ to be governed either by τύχοις or by εἰπὼν repeated. Klausen appears from his version to be the only commentator who has understood the two passages correctly.

604. I am inclined to understand this line as if it were written οὐκ εὐκρυπτον γίγνεται τάδε σχισθέντα εἶναι, as Blomfield takes it. Peile objects that this might be a correct translation of οὐκ εὐκρυπτα ἐστὶν or ἔφνυ, but not of οὐκ εὐκρυπτα γίγνεται: but the full force of γίγνεται may be given, "It is becoming" (that is, at this stage of our conversation) "no easy matter for you to conceal," &c. Still, I am by no means confident that he and Scholefield are not right in translating, "for, when divided, these things are not well concealed."

605. Paley, in correcting ἀνὴρ for ἀνῆρ, does not mention that Peile has done the same thing. They are clearly right.

then Electra going back to an intermediate stage of the argument, and the Chorus going back too, and at the last only coming to a doubtful conviction in the words μῶν οὖν Ὀρέστου. Stanley's note, quoted by Blomfield, seems to show that he understood the key to the passage, the words κείραιτό νιν; but his successors have not profited by his elucidation.

\* τὰψευδῇ has been proposed by Linwood in a second edition of his *Lexicon*, published since these notes were written.

ΧΟ. πότερον ἀναχθεὶς ἐμφανῶς ἐξ Ἰλίου,  
ἢ χεῖμα, κοινὸν ἄχθος, ἥρπασε στρατοῦ ;

ΚΗ. ἔκυρσας, ὥστε τοξότης ἄκρος, σκοποῦ·  
μακρὸν δὲ πῆμα συντόμως ἐφημίσω.

610

ΧΟ. πότερα γὰρ αὐτοῦ ζῶντος, ἢ τεθνηκότος  
φάτις πρὸς ἄλλων ναυτίλων ἐκλήζετο ;

ΚΗ. οὐκ οἶδεν οὐδεὶς ὥστ' ἀπαγγεῖλαι τορῶς,  
πλὴν τοῦ τρέφοντος ἡλίου χθονὸς φύσιν.

ΧΟ. πῶς γὰρ λέγεις χειμῶνα ναυτικῷ στρατῷ  
ἐλθεῖν τελευτῆσαί τε, δαιμόνων κότῳ ;

615

ΚΗ. εὖφημον ἡμαρ οὐ πρέπει κακαγγέλῳ  
γλώσση μαίνειν· χωρὶς ἢ τιμὴ θεῶν.  
ὅταν δ' ἀπευκτὰ πῆματ' ἄγγελος πόλει  
στυγνῷ προσώπῳ πτωσίμου στρατοῦ φέρῃ,  
πόλει μὲν ἔλκος ἐν τὸ δῆμιον τυχεῖν,  
πολλοὺς δὲ πολλῶν ἐξαγισθέντας δόμων  
ἄνδρας διπλῇ μάστιγι, τὴν Ἄρης φιλεῖ,

620

607. Here both Peile and Paley have gone wrong, in connecting *στρατοῦ* with *κοινὸν ἄχθος*, which the latter renders, “quod esset commune damnum exercitus,” comparing *γυναικοποιῶν πολέμων ἄρωγαν*, v. 216. The natural rendering is much better, “or did a tempest, falling on all alike, carry him off from the main armament?” It is this *κοινὸν ἄχθος*, the universality of the tempest, which forms part of the “good guess” of the Chorus, and leads them to question further in v. 615, assuming that the herald has already spoken of a general storm. Wrong too are Peile and Paley in their interpretation of vv. 611, 612, “Ha! did you learn this from himself alive, or, he being dead, was it a rumour spread by other navigators?” which is very involved, and objectionable in more ways than one, as after what the

herald had said about bad news, and Menelaus’ disappearance, the Chorus was not likely to suppose that he had seen him alive, and besides, the herald’s answer would not be a direct one to such a question. Here again the natural sense should have been followed: “Was it respecting him as living or as dead that a rumour was generally talked of by the other sailors?” i. e. Was the general impression among the rest of the sailors that he was alive or dead, if any impression there was? *αὐτοῦ*, κ. τ. λ. being either taken in connexion with *φάτις*, or as a case absolute.

615. “Enarra, quomodo tempestas ira deorum immissa Argivis inciderit. ἐλθεῖν τελευτῆσαί τε h. e. ab initio ad finem. Non video quomodo hæc verba significare possint quod dedit Klausen: Num tempestas classi missa infaustum per

- CHO. What, had he clearly loosed from Ilion then,  
Or did some general tempest sweep him off?
- HER. Aye, thou hast hit the mark, like a prime archer,  
And in few words declared a lengthy grief.
- CHO. Was it of him as living or as dead  
That tales were bruited by the other sailors?
- HER. Why, no one knows, to tell with certainty,  
Except the sun that nourishes this earth.
- CHO. How is it then thou say'st a tempest came  
Upon the host, and stayed, from wrath of Heaven?
- HER. A day of joy it is not meet to stain  
With evil words. Heaven's honour is unmixed.  
But when a herald brings with doleful face  
News to a city of its army slain,  
One public wound inflicted on the state,  
And many men from many homes chased forth  
By the fell double scourge which Ares loves,

iram divinam habuit finem?" Paley. *πῶς* goes with *ἐλθεῖν*, κ. τ. λ., not with *λέγεις*, expressing not a doubt about the assertion, but a question about the particulars.

618. *χωρὶς ἡ τιμὴ θεῶν*. The explanation I have followed, though not unobjectionable, is not so harsh as Scholefield's, "the gods have each his own honour exclusively," which is not defended by the passages Peile quotes, where the two things distinguished from each other are expressed separately, instead of being blended together like *ἡ τιμή*.

619. *ἔταν δ'*. Klausen supplies the ellipse quite wrongly, "Talía enim sunt hæc mala quæ enarranda habeam qualia quando dolorem detestabilem fert etc." The herald is evidently *contrasting* what follows with the general character of the tidings he has to bring.

621. *πόλει*, so far as the language is concerned, may be taken either with *φέρη* or with *τυχεῖν*, but as the

former would be tautological, it is better to adopt the latter, which is a sufficiently common construction. Peile seems to think *ἐν τῷ δήμῳ* is exactly equivalent to *ἐν καὶ δήμῳ*, at the same time that he taxes Blomfield with giving a translation which belongs rather to *ἐν δήμῳ τε*. Surely however "*unum vulnus, nempe publicum*" represents the sense as nearly as possible, *τὸ δῆμον* being added to explain how it came to be a single wound, namely, by being *the national* calamity. This does not contradict the doctrine that the article assumes its predicate, which will be equally true in either case, nor does it oblige us to take *ἐν* as opposed to *ἕτερον*, as it may still be held to answer to *πολλὰ ἔλκη* implied in *πολλοὺς δὲ πολλῶν*, κ. τ. λ. "saying that on the city there has fallen a single wound, I mean the public one."

623. *διπλῇ μάστιγι* can hardly be taken (as Bothe, Klausen, Dindorf,



δίλογχον ἄτην, φοινίαν ξυνωρίδα·  
 τοιῶνδε μέντοι πημάτων σεσαγμένον, 625  
 πρέπει λέγειν παιᾶνα τόνδ' Ἑρινύων·  
 σωτηρίων δὲ πραγμάτων εὐάγγελον  
 ἤκοντα πρὸς χαίρουσαν εὐεστοῖ πόλιν —  
 πῶς κεδνὰ τοῖς κακοῖσι συμμίξω, λέγων  
 χειμῶν' Ἀχαιῶν οὐκ ἀμήνιτον θεοῖς; 630  
 ξυνώμοσαν γάρ, ὄντες ἔχθιστοι τὸ πρὶν,  
 πῦρ καὶ θάλασσα, καὶ τὰ πίστ' ἐδειξάτην,  
 φθείροντε τὸν δύστηνον Ἀργείων στρατόν.  
 ἐν νυκτὶ δυσκύμαντα δ' ὠρώρει κακά·  
 ναῦς γὰρ πρὸς ἀλλήλησι Θρήκiai πνοαὶ 635  
 ἤρεικον· αἱ δὲ, κεροτυπούμεναι βία  
 χειμῶνι τυφῶ σὺν ζάλῃ τ' ὀμβροκτύπῳ,  
 ὥχοντ' ἄφαντοι, ποιμένος κακοῦ στρόβῳ.  
 ἐπεὶ δ' ἀνῆλθε λαμπρὸν ἡλίου φάος,  
 ὁρῶμεν ἀνθοῦν πέλαγος Αἰγαῖον νεκροῖς 640  
 ἀνδρῶν Ἀχαιῶν ναυτικῶν τ' ἐρειπίων.  
 ἡμᾶς γε μὲν δὴ ναῦν τ', ἀκήρατον σκάφος,  
 ἦτοι τις ἐξέκλεψεν, ἢ ἔζητήσατο  
 θεός τις, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, οἶακος θιγῶν.

and Paley contend) for the public and private calamities (though the next line may very well refer to this double blow), as it is made the instrument with which the private calamity is inflicted. It must therefore mean the double scourge, such as appears to have been commonly used, while it may probably signify further fire and sword, if it be thought that the metaphor requires pressing in this particular.

626. Blomfield's construction of τόνδ' with ἄγγελον is very harsh. The position clearly shows it to refer to παιᾶνα, not however, as Klausen and Peile take it, meaning 'this which follows,' sc. in v. 631, but

'this which I have in my mind, and which doubtless you can conceive,' such a one as would naturally come from one τοιῶνδε πημάτων σεσαγμένον.

630. There is no reason for regarding ἀμήνιτον θεοῖς as an unusual construction. Compare Suppl. 929. ἀβουκόλητον τοῦτ' ἐμῷ φρονήματι.

636. Peile retains τυφῶ, which he connects with χειμῶνι; but χειμῶνι τυφῶ is not justified by τυφῶ μένος, which Haupt quotes from Suppl. 555. Paley reads τυφῶ, but connects it with what follows, which is unnecessary, as the addition of τε need not make us supply κεροτυπούμεναι again after σὺν ζάλῃ.

637. ποιμένος κακοῦ. Boissonade,

A two-edged bane, a blood-red harnessed pair,  
 One laden with such sorrows in good truth  
 Might well sing out such Pæan of the Furies:  
 But for a messenger of prosperous luck  
 Arriving at a town where all is well—  
 How shall I mingle joy with grief, and speak  
 Of the fell storm the Achæans owe to Heaven?  
 For there were leagued those fiercest foes of yore  
 The fire and flood, and well they showed their faith  
 Destroying our unhappy Argive host.  
 And in the night the deep's dire perils woke:  
 For Thracian blasts against each other hurled  
 Our ships: and they, so dashed by the typhoon  
 And spouting gush of water, front to front,  
 Went off, as tended by some demon swain—  
 But when the sun's resplendent light came up,  
 We see the Ægean sea all blossoming  
 With corpses of Greek men and vessels wrecked.  
 Us and our vessel, an undamaged hulk,  
 Some one or stole away or else begged off,  
 Some god, not man, presiding at the helm.

quoted by Dindorf, says: "Qui de ipsa tempestate intelligunt non audiendi videntur. Sæpe in tempestatibus describendis poetæ rectoris pavidi, ποιμένος κακοῦ (quam metaphoram ipse Æschylus habet Suppl. 768.) mentionem injiciunt." But ποιμένος κακοῦ is not the same as "rectoris pavidi," and even if it were, a figurative sense would be much more after the manner of Æschylus. It is scarcely necessary to fix the meaning to the tempest: I would rather understand it generally, "whirled about as by some ill-minded shepherd."

640. νεκροῖς undoubtedly is to be taken both with ἀνδρῶν and ἐρειπίων. νεκροὶ ἐρειπίων is a bold Æschylean expression, like συνθνήσκουσα δὲ σποδὸς προπέμπει πίνοντας πλούτου πνοὰς in

v. 789. It is difficult to see why the commentators should seek to avoid it, by supposing a double construction of ἀνθεῖν in the same sentence with a genitive and dative, or, what is certainly the more probable course of the two, by altering the reading to ναυτικοῖς τ' ἐρειπίοις.

642. ἀκήρατον σκάφος, "an undamaged hull," is in apposition with ναῦν, not constructed as if it were ἀκήρατον κατὰ σκάφος, as Blomfield, Paley, and perhaps Klausen take it. σκάφος is elsewhere used for the whole vessel, but here there is no occasion to understand it so widely.

643. ἡ ἔξηγήσατο, the common reading, is at least as good as Schutz's ἡ ἐξηγήσατο, or Hermann's ἡ ἐξηρήσατο, received by Dindorf.



Τύχη δὲ σωτὴρ ναῦν θέλουσ' ἐφέζετο, 645  
 ὥς μήτ' ἐν ὄρμῳ κύματος ζάλην ἔχειν,  
 μήτ' ἐξοκείλαι πρὸς κραταιέων χθόνα.  
 ἔπειτα δ' ἄδην πόντιον πεφευγότες,  
 λευκὸν κατ' ἥμαρ, οὐ πεποιθότες τύχῃ,  
 ἐβουκολοῦμεν φροντίσιν νέον πάθος, 650  
 στρατοῦ καμόντος καὶ κακῶς σποδουμένου.  
 καὶ νῦν ἐκείνων εἴ τις ἐστὶν ἐμπνέων,  
 λέγουσιν ἡμᾶς ὡς ὀλωλότας· τί μή;  
 ἡμεῖς τ' ἐκείνους ταῦτ' ἔχειν δοξάζομεν.  
 γένοιτο δ' ὡς ἄριστα· Μενέλεων γὰρ οὖν 655  
 πρῶτόν τε καὶ μάλιστα προσδόκα μολεῖν.  
 εἰ δ' οὖν τις ἀκτὶς ἡλίου νιν ἱστορεῖ  
 καὶ ζῶντα καὶ βλέποντα, μηχαναῖς Διὸς,  
 οὐπω θέλοντος ἐξαναλῶσαι γένος,  
 ἐλπίς τις αὐτὸν πρὸς δόμους ἤξειν πάλιν. 660  
 τοσαῦτ' ἀκούσας, ἴσθι τὰ ληθῇ κλύων.

ΧΟ. τίς ποτ' ὠνόμαζεν ὧδ' στρ. α'.  
 ἐς τὸ πᾶν ἐτητύμως—  
 μή τις, ὄντιν' οὐχ ὁρῶ-  
 μεν, προνοίαισι, τοῦ πεπρωμένου 665  
 γλῶσσαν ἐν τύχῃ νέμων—

645. ναῦν στελοῦσ'. Canter's correction, "to equip or dispatch the ship," would not give the sense required: while ναυστολοῦσ', though very ingeniously accounted for by Blomfield, is too far from the original text, which is besides quite unobjectionable.

646. As my translation might seem to show that I make ζάλην the subject of ἔχειν and ἐξοκείλαι, I may just say that the subject of both of course is ἡμᾶς, the latter being used intransitively.

651. καμόντος need hardly be pressed to the meaning of *mortui*, which Blomfield would give it. The gloss of Hesychius quoted in his Glossary, κάμνειν· ἀποθνήσκειν, makes against those who understand *κεκμήκοτες* and *καμόντες* "those whose labours are over."

654. "ταῦτ' ἔχειν. Wellauer objects to this, which is the reading of Stanley, Pauw, Schutz, Bothe, Blomfield, and Scholefield (and Paley): 'Male; hoc enim foret τὰ αὐτὰ ἔχειν ἢ ἡμεῖς ἔχομεν'—but why not resolve

And saving Fortune sat upon the ship,  
 So that the surge ne'er tossed us in our haven  
 Nor dashed us out against the rocky beach.  
 Then, having 'scaped the death place of the deep  
 In the white daylight, trusting not our chance,  
 We tended with our thoughts the new distress  
 Of our lost comrades piteously destroyed.  
 And now if any of them be breathing yet  
 They talk of us as dead—why should they not?  
 We on our part are judging them the same.  
 But all is for the best. For Menelaus,  
 Foremost and first expect him to arrive.  
 And sure if any sunbeam knows of him  
 As saved and living, by the plans of Zeus,  
 Who wills not yet the race should be destroyed,  
 There is good hope that he may come back home.  
 This having heard, know, thou hast heard the truth.

CHO. Who was it that truthfully

Thus, in all points, gave the name—

Some one whom we do not see

In foreknowledge of the coming fates

Governing man's random aim—

it into ἀ ἡμᾶς ἔχειν ἐκείνοι δοξάζουσι?" Peile—or rather into ἀ ἔχοντας ἡμᾶς λέγουσι.

657. "ιστορεῖ. novit [sive aspicit]. Hesych. ιστορεῖ· μαρτυρεῖ, μυθεύει, ἐρωτᾷ, ἐρᾷ, πύθεται, ἀνακρίνει, ὀρᾷ; ubi hunc Æschyli locum Hesychio observatum fuisse censet Arnaldus Lect. Græc. p. 74." Butler, curæ secundæ. —εἰ δ' οὖν seems to express the full force of οὖν—"and if—for of course it must depend on that—" So in v. 1005, εἰ δ' οὖν ἀνάγκη τῇσδ' ἐπιρρέποι τύχης is rightly given by Paley "but if there *should* befall;" as if the intermediate thought were: "It is true that ἐκὼν οὐδεὶς δουλίῳ χρῆται ζυγῷ. Still, if need should come—

for of course I am only supposing a case of need—".

664. μή τις Peile explains "may it not have been some one—or, more clearly to express the rising thought, which μή, when thus employed, discards or deprecates as soon as formed,—I hope not some one whom, &c.:" but there is here nothing to do with *deprecating*: μή indeed expresses that the speaker is inclined to discard the thought, but only from doubt whether it can be true.

666. ἐν τύχῃ. happily. Peile, after Butler, who however afterwards admitted that no very satisfactory authority could be produced for the expression in the tragedians, Soph.

τὰν δορίγαμβρον ἀμφινεικῇ θ'  
 Ἑλέναν; ἐπεὶ πρεπόντως  
 ἑλένας, ἑλανδρος, ἐλέπτολις,  
 ἐκ τῶν ἀβροτίμων 670  
 προκαλυμμάτων ἔπλευσε  
 Ζεφύρου γίγαντος αὔρα,  
 πολύανδροί τε φεράσπιδες κυναγοὶ  
 κατ' ἵχνος πλατᾶν ἄφαντον  
 κελσάντων Σιμόεντος ἀκτὰς 675  
 ἐπ' ἀεξιφύλλους, δι' ἔριν  
 αἱματόεσσαν.  
 Ἴλίῳ δὲ κῆδος ὀρ- 680  
 θώνυμον τελεσσίφρων  
 μῆνις ἤλασεν, τραπέ-  
 ζας ἀτίμωσιν ὑστέρω χρόνῳ  
 καὶ ξυνεστίου Διὸς  
 πρασσομένα τὸ νυμφότιμον

Œd. T. 80 not being quite to the point. Possibly τύχα may here bear its ordinary sense—"guiding the tongue in chance," i. e. in the realm of chance, amidst the thousand chances that are constantly presenting themselves. τύχη is elsewhere spoken of as a definite object, or in the language of the Schoolmen, as an entity: e. g. v. 1624. τὴν τύχην δ' ἐρώμεθα.

670. ἀβροτίμων is not un-Æschylean, and any objections to the force of the compound are sufficiently met by the passage adduced by Peile from Eur. Iph. T. 1148. χαίτας ἀβρόπλουτον εἰς ἔριν. Under such circumstances it does not seem necessary to read ἀβροπήνων, though that word would doubtless be very appropriate here.

672. The Zephyr can hardly be called γίγαντος merely because it is *earthborn*, (as Juvenal uses *frater-*

*culus gigantis* as a synonyme for *ter-ræ filius*) though doubtless that was one of the reasons for the name. Hesychius' gloss, γίγαντος· μεγάλου, ἰσχυροῦ, ὑπερφανοῦς gives the notion of *strength*, which was probably the main one in the poet's mind.

674. There can be no question about κατ' ἵχνος πλατᾶν ἄφαντον being the true reading, though none of the later editors have received it, except Peile and Dindorf, and the former "principally to avoid the forced interpretation of κελσάντων." However that may fare, it is clear that those who are content with Wellauer's explanation, πλάταν ἄφαντον "the ship now out of sight," would obliterate the most thoroughly poetical touch in the passage, the hunters searching for the vanished track of the fugitives' oars on the glassy surface—that which I have tried to express in my two lines

To that bride of spears and fierce debates,  
 Helen? for right fitly she  
 Hell of vessels, hell of heroes, hell of states,  
 Spread the flying sail  
 From her chambers' gorgeous veil  
 To the Titan Zephyr's gale:  
 While along the trackless highway of the water  
 There were following in her oars' evanished wake  
 Many hunters bearing shields, afire for slaughter,  
 As they landed by Simois' woody brake.  
 Thus to Troy the 'wedlock-woe'  
 Heaven's avenging justice drove,  
 For the wrongs of long ago  
 The dishonour of the friendly board,  
 And the hearth's assessor Jove,  
 Bringing anger down on those who poured

"While along the trackless highway of the water There were following in her oars' evanished wake," &c. Symmons, as might be expected, has given it in his version "Hunters on the glass-wave track of her evanescent oars." It would be needless to cite passages where similar images occur. They abound in poetry. I will only refer to that treasure-house of poetical images, (as it has been found to be by at least one poet of the present day, who in his "Palace of Art" has borrowed from parts of the powerful description of the Egyptian darkness\*;)—I mean the Apocryphal Book of Wisdom, ch. V. 10. "As a ship that passeth over the waves of

the water, which when it is gone by, the trace thereof cannot be found, neither the pathway of the keel in the waves." Compare too the end of Shelley's Ode to Liberty.—*κελσάντων* (for which there was no occasion to read *κέλσαντες*, thus introducing an unsuitable tense as referring to the hunters), sc. the fugitives, is to be classed with other instances wherein Æschylus uses the genitive absolute somewhat harshly, such as in v. 1131, and still more v. 1245, Prom. 863.

678. 'Wedlock-woe' for *κῆδος* is from Symmons. It is not particularly happy, but I know of nothing better. Peile's *Woman* will hardly do.

\* See Wisdom, ch. XVII. 2, "Lay there exiled from the eternal Providence." v. 18, 19, "Whether it were a whistling wind, or a melodious noise of birds among the spreading branches, or a pleasing fall of water running violently, or a horrible sound of stones cast down, or a running that could not be seen of skipping beasts, or a roaring voice of most savage wild beasts, or a rebounding echo from the hollow mountains: these things made them to swoon for fear." The translator has not always been very fortunate in his choice of words: but these occasional instances of bad taste do not obscure the beauty of the whole, as Mr. Tennyson has perceived.

μέλος ἐκφάτως τίοντας,  
 ὑμέναιον, ὃς τότε ἐπέρρεπεν  
 γαμβροῖσιν αἰδεῖν.  
 μεταμανθάνουσα δ' ὕμνον  
 Πριάμου πόλις γεραῖα  
 πολύθρηνον μέγα που στένει, κικλήσκου-  
 σα Πάριν τὸν αἰνόλεκτρον,  
 πάμπροσθ' ἢ πολύθρηνον αἰῶν'  
 ἀμφὶ πολιτᾶν μέλεον  
 αἰμ' ἀνατλάσα.

685

690

ἔθρεψεν δὲ λέοντα  
 σίνιν δόμοις ἀγάλακτον  
 οὕτως ἀνὴρ φιλόμαστον,  
 ἐν βίотου προτελείοις  
 ἄμερον, εὐφιλόπαιδα,  
 καὶ γεραροῖς ἐπίχαρτον.

στρ. β'.

695

684. ἐκφάτως is to be taken in close connection with τίοντας, which might justly be considered harsh without it, as applied to τὸ νυμφό- τιμον μέλος—"honouring the nuptial strain,"—how? "by their clear voices," as Wellauer alone of all the commentators has seen that it is to be rendered. Klausen's *nimium*, Haupt's *supra modum*, and Blomfield's *modo ineffabili*, may all be dismissed, as in no way assisting the sense. Paley's explanation of τίον- τας, "*nunc* demum poenas pendentes pro eo hymenæo, quem *tunc* Paridis fratulus canere accidit," is ingenious, and confirmed by the passage he has quoted, Choeph. 435, as well as by many in Homer; but he confesses he does not know what to make of ἐκφάτως. Besides, can τίω be used convertibly with τίνω? Liddell and Scott say not. Even if it could, τίωντος, Schutz's correction,

could scarcely stand with the accusative for 'avenging the crime of singing,' however it may appear from v. 1292 that τίνειν τινί τι can bear the meaning of paying to a person a certain recompense, not only in the way of atonement, but of punishment.

691. "πάμπροσθ' ἢ in Herm.: optime, quum aptissima sit particula ἢ ante repetitum πολύθρηνον." Klausen. But for the position of πάμπροσθ', we might take πολύθρηνον in each case in the same construction, namely, as an adverb with μέγα που στένει, πολύθρηνον, ἢ πολύθρηνον. Linwood would refer both to αἰῶνα. This would require us to take αἰῶν' with στένει, not with ἀνατλάσα, with which it goes more naturally: and Peile is more likely to be right in taking the first πολύθρηνον with ὕμνον (μεταμανθάνουσα ὕμνον ὥστε πολύθρηνον εἶναι: compare v. 119 and the note there,

That entrancing music's flow,  
 Hymenæus, which was sung with sweet accord  
 By the nuptial throng,  
 But now taught another song  
 Priam's town by suffering long  
 Many groans from her old heart is heaving, crying  
 Upon Paris, the unfortunately wed,  
 With a life of many groans behind her lying  
 Groans and anguish, when her sons around her bled.

Once a man a lion bred  
 In his home, a household pest,  
 Young, yet not by suckling fed,  
 Though with joy it sought the breast:  
 Now while in life's outer court  
 Beautiful and bright,

and v. 1214 below), and the second with αἰῶν'. Nor will the force of the repetition be less, as we may see by translating nearly in Peile's words, "learning now a song changed to one of much weeping, the aged city of Priam is doubtless now greatly wailing, . . . for with a life of much weeping in truth was it that she had all along to struggle over her people's piteous blood."

695. Peile's construction of ἀγάλακτον οὕτως, if we consider the passages he adduces, comes not to 'just a fosterbrother,' but to 'so like one of this family did a man bring up,' &c. which would not be a good introduction of the subject. In all the references given οὕτως means not 'just so' but 'so,' referring to something expressed or understood, e. g. ἀμέριμνος οὕτως, so (as you see me): ἀκάλυπτον οὕτω δεικνύναι, to show so exposed (as this): οὐδ' ἐπὶ ἀδύνατον ἀμύνεσθαι οὕτω πόλιν ἐρχόμεθα, so defenceless (as people think); just as we use *so* in such expressions as "not so bad." Klausen says rightly,

"οὕτως similitudinem introducit." He is right also in rendering ἀγάλακτον *sine lacte*, as the sense of a foster-brother, which, as he remarks, would be absurd if taken literally, is not particularly appropriate: though he does not appear to see its true meaning, as an epithet used *more Æschyleo* to show the real object of the comparison—"not a real cub—not fed with milk—but a woman, Helen," in the same way as the great body of expressions of which the scriptural "drunken, but not with wine," is generally taken as a type. The curtain is removed, though but for a moment, lest it should be taken for the real painting.

699. γεραπὸς *may* doubtless be used in the neuter as a *thing* of honour, quite consistently with its being applied in the masculine to a *person* of honour (as it certainly is in Hom. Il. III. 170) or an old man, like πρέσβυς: but that is no reason why with Donaldson and Paley we should make it mean *gifts* here. Donaldson urges further that ἐπίχαπτος τινι is

πολέα δ' ἔσκ' ἐν ἀγκάλαις 700  
 νεοτρόφου τέκνου δίκαν,  
 φαιδρωπὸς ποτὶ χεῖρα, σαί-  
 νων τε γαστρὸς ἀνάγκαις.  
 χρονισθεῖς δ' ἀπέδειξεν ἀντ. β'.  
 ἔθος τὸ πρὸς γε τοκῆων· 705  
 χάριν τροφᾶς γὰρ ἀμείβων  
 μηλοφόνοισιν ἄσαισιν  
 δαῖτ' ἀκέλευστος ἔτευξεν·  
 αἵματι δ' οἶκος ἐφύρθη,  
 ἄμαχον ἄλγος οἰκέταις, 710  
 μέγα σίνος πολυκτόνον·  
 ἐκ θεοῦ δ' ἱερεὺς τις ἄ-  
 τας δόμοις προσεθρέφθη.

παρ' αὐτὰ δ' ἐλθεῖν ἐς Ἰλίου πόλιν στρ. γ'.  
 λέγοιμ' ἂν φρόνημα μὲν νηνέμου γαλάνας· 715  
 ἀκασκαῖον δ' ἄγαλμα πλούτου  
 μαλθακὸν ὀμμάτων βέλος,  
 δηξίθυμον ἔρωτος ἄνθος·

always 'an object of rejoicing over' in a bad sense: but surely if ἐπίχαρτος can be used in both senses indifferently without a dative of the person, it is idle to argue from a single instance like Prom. 158 (where by the bye the reading is not certain,) that it must be restricted simply because the person rejoicing happens to be expressed.

705. Bothe's γε, received by Peile, seems the best suggestion which has been offered to fill up the gap in the old text, τὸ πρὸς \*τοκῆων.

707. ἄσαισιν, a word from its original meaning of *surfeit* peculiarly suitable here, had occurred to me before Linwood announced it in his Lexicon as a conjecture of Professor Malden. It is certainly less excep-

tionable than any of the other readings, ἄταισι, the old text, which is undoubtedly unmetrical, ἀγαῖσι, Klausen's correction, which is suspected of the same fault, and Hermann's ἄγαισι, which even after it has been brought to mean "invidiosa cæde pecoris," does not make very apt sense. μηλοφόνοισι may either be taken actively or passively, "surfeit involving the slaughter of sheep," or "surfeit on slaughtered sheep," like ἀνδροφθόρου αἵματος, μητροκτόνον αἶμα quoted by Peile.

714. παρ' αὐτὰ has clearly a sense of comparison, not that given by Blomfield, "statim," though the reference to Hesychius shows that it might have that meaning in another connection.

Joining children in their sport,  
 And old men's delight.  
 Often in their arms he lay,  
 Like an infant, day by day,  
 Licking outstretched hands in play,  
 While he fawned by nature's law  
 At the cravings of his maw.  
 But in time he ceased to fawn  
 And the nature then displayed  
 From his savage parents drawn:  
 Ill was all that care repaid,  
 For he made of slaughtered sheep  
 His forbidden food,  
 While the house was floating deep  
 In a pool of blood.  
 Monster—yet no art they knew  
 To expel him or subdue,  
 While the flocks he daily slew:  
 Such a priest of Ate, nursed  
 In their halls, they saw and cursed.

And so should I say to Ilion's tower  
 There came a sweet face like summer skies,  
 A fair gentle image of rich wealth,  
 The arrow of men's eyes,  
 Love's soul-consuming flower,

716. “ὀμμάτων βέλος hic de telo  
 oculos feriente, non ex oculis mis-  
 so.” Klausen, after Schutz: “ὀμ-  
 μάτων igitur non de Helenæ, sed de  
 virorum et juvenum oculis recipien-  
 dum, qui forma ejus spectata amore  
 urebantur.” This interpretation is  
 strongly confirmed by Hdt. V. 18.  
 where the Persians complain that  
 women sitting opposite are ἀλγηδό-  
 νας σφι ὀφθαλμῶν. βέλος then, like  
 ἄνθος in the next line, and φρόνημα  
 and ἄγαλμα are all constructed with  
 εἰλθεῖν, instead of the involved struc-

ture proposed by Peile.

718. παρακλίνουσ' has been va-  
 riously taken by those who, cor-  
 rectly, detach it from what goes be-  
 fore as “deflectens ab indole priore”  
 (Heath. Wellauer. Dindorf. Paley),  
 and “deflectens statum felicitatis et  
 lætitia” (Klausen): but the sense of  
 “lying down” proposed by Dyer in  
 his Tentamina Æschylea (London  
 1841) is more simple and agrees  
 with what follows. Those who agree  
 with Heath, &c. will not complain of  
 its being used intransitively.



παρακλίνουσ' ἐπέκρανε  
 δὲ γάμου πικρὰς τελευτὰς,  
 δύσεδρος καὶ δυσόμιλος  
 συμένα Πριαμίδαισιν,  
 πομπᾷ Διὸς ξενίου,  
 νυμφοκλαυτὸς Ἐρινύς.

720

παλαίφατος δ' ἐν βροτοῖς γέρων λόγος  
 τέτυκται, μέγαν τελεσθέντα φωτὸς ὄλβον  
 τεκνοῦσθαι, μηδ' ἄπαιδα θνήσκειν·  
 ἐκ δ' ἀγαθὰς τύχας γένει  
 βλαστάνειν ἀκόρεστον οἰζύν.  
 δίχα δ' ἄλλων μονόφρων εἰ-  
 μί· τὸ γὰρ δυσσεβὲς ἔργον  
 μετὰ μὲν πλείονα τίκτει,  
 σφετέρᾳ δ' εἰκότα γέννα.

ἀντ. γ'.

726

730

719. Bothe's conjecture (in his first edition) γάμους πικροτελεύτους, supported by the variation in the Flor. MS. πικροῦ, has not perhaps been sufficiently attended to by the editors. It would remove the necessity of supposing any variation in the metre (though justified by such passages as Pers. 649, 654) and consequently adopting Pauw's correction in v. 731. τὸ δυσσεβὲς γὰρ ἔργον.

724. It appears much more natural to translate νυμφοκλαυτὸς "mourned of brides" (the sense being, "though coming as a bride she proved no true bride, but a bane to all wed-

lock") than to make it stand for νύμφη κλαυτή. The case is not quite the same as that of προβουλόπαις v. 374, as there the compound is differently formed. κλαυτόνυμφος, had such a word existed, might have stood for κλαυτή νύμφη, like μελλόνυμφος, Soph. Ant. 633, for μέλλουσα νύμφη.

727. This passage used to be entirely mistaken, as if it spoke of children as a crown to happiness, τεκνοῦσθαι μηδ' ἄπαιδα θνήσκειν being taken as the subject of which μέγαν τελεσθέντα φωτὸς ὄλβον was predicated. So Potter,

With joy we see our offspring rise,  
 And happy, who not childless dies;  
 and even Symmons,

'Twas said of old, and men maintain it still,  
 Fortune, how great soe'er, is never crowned,  
 But when the great possessor, at the close  
 Of earthly grandeur, leaves an heir behind,  
 And sinks not childless to his grave.

Blomfield however set the sense right, and the rest have followed him.

728. γένει has not been explained by the editors, probably because they thought it meant "to a family;" but

But then, lying down by him by stealth,  
 She wrought a bitter marriage in that hour,  
     Evil neighbour, evil guest,  
         Springing on the Priamids,  
     At the Xenian Jove's behest,  
         Fury, mourned of youthful brides.  
 There lives among men an ancient creed  
     That the great perfect fulness of man's wealth  
 Bears sons, nor comes childless to its end,  
     But oft from bliss and health  
         Springs up an evil seed ;  
 But I ne'er on other tongues depend :  
 For ever doth the bold unhallowed deed  
     Bring forth many more to light,  
         Like the parents, like the brood :

the common human family to which the succession of fortune is attached does not seem to be in the mind of the poet. Men are mere accidents, the *ῥῆμα* with which the gods deal; it is the generation of weal and woe which occupies his thoughts. *γένει* will then be, "for a family," "by way of family," as in Choeph. 13. *νεπτέροις μειλίγμασιν*. It is true that in v. 734 he seems to regard the succession as embodied in a mortal house; and perhaps there may be a partial identification of the two, as the generations both happening in *time*, as a metaphysician would say, will often coincide, the issue of a man's fortune showing itself in the person, or in the days, of his own issue: still the *γένος* principally intended by Æschylus seems to be a moral rather than a physical one.

730. The *παλαίφατος λόγος* had maintained that there was an invariable law of generation which caused excessive misery to succeed good fortune: the Chorus says No;

the only invariable law of succession being that evil produces evil, as good good; and it is merely from an occasional coincidence, good fortune being sometimes attended with evil practices, which bring evil on the perpetrator, that prosperity ever appears to issue in misery. It is difficult to disentangle thoroughly the line of thought, and see whether it is crime or misery that is meant by evil (as similarly whether the *καλλίπαις πότμος* is so called from being prosperous or just); but we need not suspect Æschylus of confusion of thought, as he doubtless took a large view of the moral world, viewing both crime and suffering as connected with the depravation of a right and good order of things, though when the one had once been introduced the other might be necessary to prevent that righteous order from being utterly obliterated; so that the production of one crime from another (as in v. 363 sqq.) and the recompense of evil to the evil

οἴκων γὰρ εὐθυδίκων  
καλλίπαις πότμος αἰεί.

735  
στρ. δ΄.

φιλεῖ δὲ τίκτειν ὕβρις μὲν παλαιὰ  
νεάζουσιν ἐν κακοῖς βροτῶν ὕβριν  
τότ' ἢ τόθ', ὅταν τὸ κύριον  
μόλῃ, †νεαρὰ φάους κότον,  
δαίμονά τε τὸν ἄμαχον, ἀπόλεμον,  
ἀνίερν θράσος μελαί-  
νας μελάθροισιν ἄτας,  
εἰδόμενον τοκεῦσιν.

740

Δίκα δὲ λάμπει μὲν ἐν δυσκάπνοις δώ-  
μασιν, τὸν δ' ἐναΐσιμον τίει βίον·  
τὰ χρυσόπαστα δ' ἐσθλὰ σὺν  
πίνῳ χερῶν παλιντρόποις  
ὄμμασι λιποῦσ' ὅσια προσέβα,  
δύναμιν οὐ σέβουσα πλού-  
του παράσημον αἶνῳ·  
πᾶν δ' ἐπὶ τέρμα νωμᾷ.

ἀντ. δ΄.  
745  
750

doer (as in v. 1530 sqq.) would stand out before him in equal prominence, as alike parts of the great Theogony.

736. With regard to the text, Paley is the only editor who has attended to Blomfield's admonition, "desiderari particulam δὲ quæ respondeat τῷ μὲν in v. 738" (736). Accordingly he proposes in v. 739, νεαρὰ δὲ (or νέα δὲ) φύει (or φύουσα) Κόρον, all of which corrections had previously occurred to myself (as indeed they naturally would to any one considering the passage), except Κόρον, which was long ago proposed by Wakefield. But then we get into the interminable question of metre, which is hardly ever likely to be settled while the text of the strophe is uncertain and that of the

antistrophe tolerably pliable. Not professing to be sufficiently skilled in Greek metres to attempt introducing any thing like a change, as what Æschylus might have written, I have not ventured, in the unfixedness of the antistrophe, to disturb even ὅταν in v. 738, though objected to by almost every one; φύει suits the sense and metre better, φύουσα the original text φάους. Κόρον is probably the best suggestion that has been proposed for κότον, (for those who read φάους σκότον are obviously on a wrong track) though κόρος, being the less atrocious, should rather be the parent of ὕβρις, as Theognis represents it (compare also the note on v. 363) than the reverse, in spite of the authority of Hdt. VIII. 77 to the contrary. Pa-

While from houses just and right  
 Comes an offspring ever good.  
 The old wrong will aye produce a new,  
 To spring up in man's unhappy path,  
 Whene'er the appointed time is due :  
 The new one soon gives birth to wrath,  
 And the dæmon, whom no one may subdue,  
 Boldness' foul unhallowed might,  
 Brought in Ate's halls to light  
 Like its parents to the sight.  
 But justice in smoky houses shines,  
 And honors the holy life and clean ;  
 And flying from the glittering mines  
 Where filthiness of hands is seen,  
 With turned eyes repairs to purer shrines ;  
 Caring not for wealth or pride  
 In report's false tincture dyed,  
 To the end she all doth guide.

ley proceeds very ingeniously to read *μελαίνα μελάβροισιν Ἄτα, εἰδομένα τοκεῦσιν, Κόρος* and *Θράσος* being *δύο Ἄτα. μελαίνας μελάβροισιν Ἄτας* however means, what it is surprising that none of the editors should have seen, "in the halls of black Ate."—So *ἐν μεγάροισι* occurs frequently in Homer, somewhat pleonastically, when domestic matters are described, e. g. *Il. I. 396, II. 661, τράφη ἐν μεγάρῳ εὐπήκτῳ*, and *ἐν δόμοις* in the Pseudo-Euripides, *Iph. Aul. 416. ἦν Ἰφιγένειαν ὠνόμαξας ἐν δόμοις*. The relationship supposed between *Ἄτη* and *Ἰβρις* I do not pretend to adjust. *εἰδόμεναν* will then have to be changed into *εἰδόμενον*, an obvious alteration mentioned by Blomfield, who however rejects it, not seeing the true construction.

744. Klausen's notion that *Δίκα δὲ λάμπει* refers to the vindictive light of justice seen in the houses blackened by her bolts, cannot be

maintained, as the antistrophe clearly speaks of Justice as manifested by man, not by the Deity. Equally untenable are the arguments by which he attempts to assert the common version. The passage from Eur. *Electr. 1140*, quoted by Blomfield, shows that the Greeks might very well speak of *πένητες δόμοι* and *πολύκαπνον στέγος* as convertible terms. Nor was Æschylus' aristocratic feeling likely to prevent him from saying that Justice dwelt with the poor rather than the rich, any more than from making, as he constantly does, the Chorus deprecate and suspect great prosperity.

746. *ἔσθλα* has been already questioned by Auratus, who would read *ἔδεθλα*. *θέμεθλα* is another conjecture mentioned by Haupt. Perhaps *ἄθλα, prizes*, may be the true reading. *δοια* in v. 748 rather confirms *ἔσθλα*.

ἄγε δὴ, βασιλεῦ, Τροίας πολίπορθ',  
 Ἀτρέως γένεθλον,

πῶς σε προσείπω; πῶς σε σεβίζω,  
 μήθ' ὑπεράρας μήθ' ὑποκάμψας

755

καιρὸν χάριτος;

πολλοὶ δὲ βροτῶν τὸ δοκεῖν εἶναι

προτίουσι δίκην παραβάντες.

τῷ δυσπραγοῦντι δ' ἐπιστενάχειν

πᾶς τις ἔτοιμος, δῆγμα δὲ λύπης

760

οὐδὲν ἐφ' ἧπαρ προσικνέεται·

καὶ ξυγχαίρουσιν ὁμοιοπρεπεῖς

ἀγέλαστα πρόσωπα βιαζόμενοι.

ὅστις δ' ἀγαθὸς προβατογνῶμων,

οὐκ ἔστι λαθεῖν ὄμματα φωτὸς

765

τὰ δοκοῦντ' εὖφρονος ἐκ διανοίας

ὑδαρεῖ σαίνειν φιλότητι.

σὺ δέ μοι τότε μὲν, στέλλων στρατιὰν

Ἑλένης ἔνεκ', οὐ γὰρ σ' ἐπικεύσω,

κάρτ' ἀπομούσως ἦσθα γεγραμμένος,

770

οὐδ' εὖ πραπίδων οἶακα νέμων,

θράσος ἀκούσιον

ἀνδράσι θνήσκουσι κομίζων·

νῦν δ' οὐκ ἀπ' ἄκρας φρενὸς, οὐδ' ἀφίλως,

εὖφρων πόνος εὖ τελέσασι.

775

γνώσει δὲ χρόνῳ διαπευθόμενος

τόν τε δικαίως καὶ τὸν ἀκαίρως

πόλιν οἰκουροῦντα πολιτῶν.

757. τὸ δοκεῖν εἶναι προτίουσι τοῦ εἶναι. Paley. Here it is easy to supply the full sense of προτίειν: elsewhere it has to be taken generally for *to set great store by*, like our word *prefer*—as in v. 1643, μὴ προτιμήσης ματαίων τῶνδ' ὑλαγμάτων, where Heath wanted to read με προτιμήσης.

762. “ξυγχαίρουσι minime pro dativo habendum, qui omissus est et facile intelligitur.” Klausen, who also observes rightly on v. 767, “ὑδαρεῖ, locutio sumta de vino cui aqua admista. . . . Schutizio ὑδαρεῖ φιλότητι de lacrymis, quas benevolentia ex oculis stillare jubent, dictum videtur. At quænam lingua

Come, Atreus' son, my imperial liege,  
Thou taker of Troy in that tedious siege,  
How may I revere thee, or how address,  
Giving praise as is due, neither more nor less?

For many there be in neglect of right

Give the palm to empty seeming.

To the man in the race of life o'erthrown  
Each friend is prepared to accord a groan,

But no heart is reached by the sorrow's bite:  
So men too with those that joy rejoice,  
With grim looks smiling by force, not choice:  
But the man who rightly knows his flock  
Those flattering eyes can never mock,

Which pretend the part of a glowing heart,

With a waterish friendship beaming.

But thee, when erst for thy brother's bride  
Thou wast raising troops, for 'tis vain to hide,  
I viewed as one drawn by no graceful skill,  
The helm of thy soul directing ill,  
As kindling a courage against their will

In men to destruction fated.

But now from the depth of a warm heart's thought  
We own to the joy, when the work is wrought.  
And thou upon question shalt know ere long  
What watchers for right and what for wrong  
Thy arrival home have waited.

talia designaret per aquosam amicitiam, *wässerige Freundschaft*?" So my "waterish friendship" is meant to be taken like Shakspeare's "dukes of waterish Burgundy."

768. σὺ δέ μοι—γεγραμμένος is generally understood "thou wert represented for me," or "in my eyes;" but μοι may mean *by* me. "I drew thee with no delicate colouring." ἀπομούσως fixes the sense of γεγραμμένος to painting.

773. The force of θνήσκουσι seems to be "men who pro tanto were

dying," like τοὺς σωζομένους in Act. Apost. II. 47, which I see Peile compares.

774. If Klausen had attended to Blomfield's quotation from Eurip. Hec. 242. οὐ γὰρ ἄκρας καρδίας ἔψανσέ μου, he would not have ventured, certainly, his assertion "ἄκρας ubique fastigium rei, haud vero superficiem derigerat," probably his whole note. Peile has however satisfactorily disproved his interpretation *ex intima mente*, and accounted for the passages he brings forward.

## ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ.

πρῶτον μὲν Ἄργος καὶ θεοὺς ἐγχωρίους  
 δίκη προσειπεῖν, τοὺς ἐμοὶ μεταίτιους 780  
 νόστου, δικαίων θ', ὧν ἐπραξάμην πόλιν  
 Πριαμου· δίκας γὰρ οὐκ ἀπὸ γλώσσης θεοὶ  
 κλύοντες, ἀνδροθνήτας Ἰλίου φθορὰς,  
 ἐς αἵματηρόν τεύχος οὐ διχορρόπως  
 ψήφους ἔθεντο· τῷ δ' ἐναντίῳ κύτει 785  
 ἐλπίς προσήει χειρὸς οὐ πληρουμένῳ.  
 καπνῷ δ' ἀλοῦσα νῦν ἔτ' εὔσημος πόλις.  
 ἄτης θύελλαι ζῶσι· συνθνήσκουσα δὲ  
 σποδὸς προπέμπει πύονας πλούτου πνοάς.  
 τούτων θεοῖσι χρὴ πολύμνηστον χάριν 790  
 τίνειν· ἐπεὶ περ χάρπαγας ὑπερκότους  
 ἐπραξάμεσθα, καὶ γυναῖκας οὔνεκα  
 πόλιν διημάθυνεν Ἀργεῖον δάκος,  
 ἵππου νεοσσὸς, ἀσπιδηστρόφος λεῶς,  
 πήδημ' ὀρούσας ἀμφὶ Πλειάδων δύσιν· 795  
 ὑπερθορὼν δὲ πύργον ὤμησης λέων,  
 ἄδην ἔλειξεν αἵματος τυραννικοῦ.  
 θεοῖς μὲν ἐξέτεινα φροῖμιον τόδε·  
 τὰ δ' ἐς τὸ σὸν φρόνημα μέμνημαι κλύων,

783. ἀνδροθνήτας Ἰλίου φθορὰς I have taken to be in apposition with δίκας, as its order seems to indicate. Had it been placed after the following clause it might very well have been taken, not as an accusative after ψήφους ἔθεντο = ἐψηφίσαντο, which would be harsh and unnecessary, but like ἀρωγὰν, v. 216, representing the general effect. As it is, the ἀνδρ. Ἰ. φθ. appears to be the subject of the cause, whether we suppose the question to have been prospective as to the future destruction of Troy, or, as I am rather in-

clined to take it, as after the event, the gods sitting in council to inquire whether things had been justly done.

786. ἐλπίς χειρὸς is hardly an expression in the style of Greek poetry. If χειρὸς be sound, it must be taken with οὐ πληρουμένῳ, like κρεισσόνων νικώμενος, though as πληροῦσθαι naturally takes a genitive of the thing with, not the instrument by which a vessel is filled, Æschylus is not very likely to have produced such an ambiguity. I lean strongly to Symmons' conjecture, χρεῖως (poor,

## AGAMEMNON.

First, Argos and my country's gods 'tis meet  
 That I address: they helped in my return  
 And in the justice which I wrought the town  
 Of Priam: for the gods from no man's tongue  
 Hearing the cause of Ilion's murderous fall  
 Into the bloody urn without one doubt  
 Cast forth their votes: while at the other vase  
 Filled by no hand stood Hope expectantly.  
 The smoke yet clearly shows the town is taken.  
 The storms of Ate live: while dying with it  
 The ashes send rich blasts of wealth consumed.  
 For this one ought to pay memorial thanks  
 To Heaven; for we have avenged the atrocious rape,  
 And the great city in a woman's cause  
 Has now been levelled by the Argive beast,  
 The offspring of the horse, a shielded throng,  
 Springing its leap about the Pleiads' setting;  
 And bounding o'er the tower the ravening lion  
 Has licked the blood of princes to its fill.  
 Be then this prelude to the gods addressed:  
 But, for thy words, I bear them in my mind,

needy), as the words or at least forms connected with them are frequently and very naturally confused. See Eum. 260. 280, in quoting which I would not be understood as assenting at once to Jacobs' correction in the latter place. Paley has recently adopted Casaubon's *χεῖλος*, but I doubt whether the poet ever thought of Pandora's box, any allusion to which would rather seem to spoil the sense. Hope being left at the bottom of a box from which all kinds of evils had been allowed to escape is natural enough: but Hope peering over the rim of a vessel which required to be filled with peb-

bles would be rather out of place.

791. Tyrwhitt is surely right in substituting *χάρπας* for *καὶ πάγας*, a conjecture also made by Salzmann (*Observationum in Aesch. Ag. Specimen*. Berlin, 1822), seemingly without the knowledge that he had been anticipated. Even if *ἐπραξάμεσθα* could conveniently mean, "we have constructed for ourselves against others," as Paley's *ἐφραξάμεσθα* might, the expression "we have wrought vindictive snares" would not be very forcible in itself, and would introduce from such passages as vv. 346—350 a metaphor foreign to the present context.



καὶ φημὶ ταυτὰ, καὶ ξυνήγορόν μ' ἔχεις. 800  
παύροις γὰρ ἀνδρῶν ἐστὶ συγγενὲς τόδε,  
φίλον τὸν εὐτυχοῦντ' ἄνευ φθόνου σέβειν.  
δύσφρων γὰρ ἰὸς, καρδίαν προσήμενος,  
ἄχθος διπλοῖζει τῷ πεπαμένῳ νόσον.  
τοῖς τ' αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ πῆμασιν βαρύνεται, 805  
καὶ τὸν θυραῖον ὄλβον εἰσορῶν στένει.  
εἰδὼς λέγοιμ' ἄν, εὖ γὰρ ἐξεπίσταμαι,  
ὁμιλίας κάτοπτρον, εἰδῶλον σκιᾶς  
δοκοῦντας εἶναι κάρτα πρευμενεῖς ἐμοί.  
μόνος δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς, ὅσπερ οὐχ ἐκὼν ἔπλει, 810  
ζευχθεὶς ἔτοιμος ἦν ἐμοὶ σειραφόρος.  
εἴτ' οὖν θανόντος, εἴτε καὶ ζῶντος πέρι  
λέγω. τὰ δ' ἄλλα πρὸς πόλιν τε καὶ θεοὺς,  
κοινοὺς ἀγῶνας θέντες ἐν πανηγύρει,  
βουλευσόμεσθα. καὶ τὸ μὲν καλῶς ἔχον, 815  
ὅπως χρονίζον εὖ μενεῖ, βουλευτέον.  
ὅτῳ δὲ καὶ δεῖ φαρμάκων παιωνίων,  
ἦτοι κέαντες, ἢ τεμόντες εὐφρόνως,  
πειρασόμεσθα πῆμ' ἀποστρέψαι νόσου.  
νῦν δ' ἐς μέλαθρα καὶ δόμους ἐφεστίους 820

802. φίλον is to be connected with σέβειν as in v. 517, where see the note. Klausen I see makes the same remark.

807. Amongst the various interpretations which might be proposed by connecting λέγοιμ' ἄν or ἐξεπίσταμαι with one or both of the words which follow, the best seems to be that arising from pointing off the words εὖ γὰρ ἐξεπίσταμαι as parenthetical. I wish however that the editors had quoted some better parallel to ὁμιλίας κάτοπτρον than the fragment of Æschylus, κάτοπτρον εἰδους χαλκός ἐστ', οἶνος δὲ νοῦ, which, like the expression mentioned by

Arist. Rhet. III. 3. as applied to the Odyssey, καλὸν ἀνθρωπίνου βίου κάτοπτρον, affords in itself no presumption that κάτοπτρον may be used in a disparaging sense.—More to the purpose would be St. Paul's expressions, I Cor. XIII. 12. δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι, II Cor. III. 18. τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι (unless we take this last to mean *reflecting*). The truth is, that to speak of a thing as a *reflexion* of another, is to praise it, if the object required is to supply a good imitation; while in a case where the presence of the original would be expected, the use of the word implies contempt—"a

And say the same, and yield thee full assent.  
 For few men have this temper born with them,  
 To court the rich as friends, yet envy not.  
 For hatred's poison, sitting at the heart,  
 Makes the load double to the man diseased :  
 First his own sorrows press on his own soul,  
 And then his neighbour's fortune makes him groan.  
 From knowledge I may say—for well I've proved it—  
 That a mere glass of friendship, a shade's shade,  
 Is all I've found of some who seemed to love me.  
 Ulysses only, who reluctant sailed,  
 When yoked, was ready to pull well with me,  
 Whether he be now at this time I speak  
 Living or dead. The rest, about the city  
 And gods, we'll settle in full conclave met  
 By free debate : and that which now is well,  
 Our care must be to keep it still in health :  
 But if a thing requires the healer's hand,  
 By cautery or by cutting for its good  
 We will attempt to drive out the disease—  
 Now to the palace and my own home's hearth

reflexion, and no more."

811. The position of *ζευχθεῖς* here in the sense of "when harnessed" slightly confirms the interpretation of *σχισθέντα* in v. 604, "when divided."

814. Butler in his *curæ secundæ* objects to Wellauer and Klausen's interpretation of *κοινούς ἀγῶνας*, "general debates," that in such cases *λόγων* is added. It is true that *ἀγῶνες* would not be used without something to determine the sense : but this *βουλευσόμεθα* does. Kennedy's suggestion, that the original meaning of *meetings* simply is the one here intended, is very probable, though the use of the plural is rather against it, as Agamemnon would hardly speak in such modern phraseology as "we will call a number of

meetings till the business is completed."

819. Klausen defends *πήματος τρέψαι νόσον* on the ground that as the *πῆμα* is the real object, it may well stand in the genitive, *νόσος* being its attribute. Æschylus however is evidently thinking for the time solely of the disease, and so would not be likely to introduce a forced expression when he might have a simple one, solely for the purpose of disturbing the metaphor. Besides, the additional image of *rout* contained in *τρέψαι* is very inferior to the simple *ἀποστρέψαι*, *to avert*. Bothe's punctuation *πήματος, τρέψαι νόσον* gives such a labouring verse, compared with the full march of *πῆμ' ἀποστρέψαι νόσον*, that we need not go into its other demerits.

ἐλθὼν θεοῖσι πρῶτα δεξιῶσομαι,  
οἷπερ πρόσω πέμψαντες ἤγαγον πάλιν.  
νίκη δ' ἐπείπερ ἔσπετ', ἐμπέδως μένοι.

ΚΛ. ἄνδρες πολῖται, πρέσβος Ἀργείων τόδε,  
οὐκ αἰσχυνοῦμαι τοὺς φιλόνορας τρόπους  
λέξαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς· ἐν χρόνῳ δ' ἀποφθίνει  
τὸ τάρβος ἀνθρώποισιν. οὐκ ἄλλων πάρα  
μαθοῦς, ἐμαυτῆς δύσφορον λέξω βίον  
τοσόνδ' ὅσονπερ οὗτος ἦν ὑπ' Ἰλίου.  
τὸ μὲν γυναῖκα πρῶτον ἄρσενος δίχα  
ἦσθαι δόμοις ἔρημον, ἔκπαγλον κακόν,  
πολλὰς κλύουσιν κληδόνας παλιγκότους·  
καὶ τὸν μὲν ἦκειν, τὸν δ' ἐπείσφerein κακοῦ  
κάκιον ἄλλο πῆμα, λάσκοντας δόμοις.  
καὶ τραυμάτων μὲν εἰ τόσων ἐτύγχανεν  
ἀνὴρ ὅδ', ὥς πρὸς οἶκον ὠχετεύετο  
φάτις, τέτρωται δικτύου πλέω λέγειν.  
εἰ δ' ἦν τεθνηκὼς, ὥς ἐπλήθυνον λόγοι,  
τρισώματος τὰν Γηρυὼν ὁ δεύτερος  
πολλὴν ἄνωθεν, τὴν κάτω γὰρ οὐ λέγω,  
χθονὸς τρίμοιρον χλαῖναν ἐξηύχει λαβὼν,  
ἅπαξ ἐκάστῳ κατθανὼν μορφώματι.  
τοιῶνδ' ἑκατὶ κληδόνων παλιγκότων,

825

830

835

840

821. δεξιῶσομαι, as we should say, "shake hands with the gods." See Liddell and Scott on the word, and compare such expressions in our own poetry as Kirke White's "Till I with death shake hands."

829. τοσόνδε agrees with βίον, as also ὅσον περ, so that there is no occasion to supply χρόνον.

833. καὶ couples the two infinitives ἦκειν and ἐπείσφerein with ἦσθαι above.

837. λέγειν. See on vv. 255. 356.

840. Symmons, in a note which

shews great classical feeling, says all that can be said for the old interpretation of this and the next line, as referring to the body of Geryon. τὴν κάτω however, though yielding a very good sense, would then be strangely expressed, nor can Schutz's correction τὸν κάτω well stand, in spite of Dunbar's objection that the article so placed must refer to something which has gone before, not to something that follows. Peile and Paley well illustrate τὴν κάτω γὰρ οὐ λέγω by referring to Sept. 949, ὑπὸ δὲ σώματι γὰς

I'll go, and first say welcome to the gods,  
Who having sent me forth have brought me back.  
And may success, that followed me, remain!

CLY. Men! citizens! ye elders of the Argives!  
I shall not blush to tell you of the love  
I bear my lord: in time men come to lose  
All sense of fear. Now what I learnt from none  
Besides myself, I'll talk of—my own life  
Of misery all the while he was at Troy.  
First for a woman from her lord cut off  
To sit at home forlorn, is crushing pain,  
As she must hear so many cross reports,  
One coming, while another brings an ill  
Worse than the former, screeching at the doors.  
And, as to wounds—if he had had so many  
As Rumour kept announcing here at home,  
He had been more pierced to speak of than a net.  
Or had he died whene'er Fame called him dead,  
Then, like a second Geryon with three bodies,  
He must have got a mighty threefold vest  
Of earth above—not counting that below—  
Suffering a death for every form he wore.  
So then I owe it to these cross reports,

*πλοῦτος ἄβυσσος ἔσται*, to which they might have added the words of Isaiah, c. XIV. 11. "The worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee." Symmons complains that such an interpretation is here frigid, as affecting mathematical precision; and so it is: but this *ψυχρότης* is just what the poet meant. Clytæmnestra, her heart being far away, does not pour out her feelings abruptly, but draws calmly and elaborately a picture of what they were, adding little side illustrations like this, and putting in every now and then a touch out of mere profusion and parade, just to

shew how she can play with the matter, half in triumph, half perhaps in that consciousness of guilt which seeks to forget itself by minute attention to some unimportant object, like Gloster in Shakspeare commending the bishop of Ely's strawberries, while he was meditating the arrest of Hastings, Rivers, &c. So after colouring the portrait of Agamemnon as Geryon the second with a superfluous accuracy, she at last gracefully affects to spare her audience an enumeration of the roods of ground under him—"for, I think, it might be tedious to speak of that."

πολλὰς ἄνωθεν ἀρτάνας ἐμῆς δέρης  
 ἔλυσαν ἄλλοι πρὸς βίαν λελημμένης. 845  
 ἐκ τῶνδ' ἐτοίμαίς ἐνθάδ' οὐ παραστατεῖ,  
 ἐμῶν τε καὶ σῶν κύριος πιστευμάτων,  
 ὥς χρῆν, Ὀρέστης· μηδὲ θαυμάσης τόδε.  
 τρέφει γὰρ αὐτὸν εὐμενῆς δορύξενος,  
 Στρόφιος ὁ Φωκεὺς, ἀμφίλεκτα πῆματα 850  
 ἐμοὶ προφωνῶν, τὸν θ' ὑπ' Ἰλίου σέθεν  
 κίνδυνον, εἴ τε δημόθρους ἀναρχία  
 βουλήν καταρρίψειεν, ὥστε σύγγγονον  
 βροτοῖσι τὸν πεσόντα λακτίσαι πλέον.  
 τοιάδε μὲν τοι σκῆψις οὐ δόλον φέρει. 855  
 ἔμοιγε μὲν δὴ κλαυμάτων ἐπίσσυτοι  
 πηγαὶ κατεσβήκασιν, οὐδ' ἐνι σταγῶν.  
 ἐν ὀψικοίτοις δ' ὄμμασιν βλάβας ἔχω,  
 τὰς ἀμφί σοι κλαίουσα λαμπτηρουχίας

844. ἄνωθεν is Virgil's "trabe nectit ab alta," nor can I see why Klausen should say that in that case "obscurius indicatum esset." From its position it would almost seem as if it were meant to be connected closely with ἀρτάνας implying ἡρτυμένας, though it may very well go with ἔλυσαν, as ἐμῆς δέρης certainly must. λελημμένης does not seem to mean "a laqueo violenter constrictum," as Paley thinks, nor need Klausen's words necessarily have such a meaning, as he merely says "λελημμένης—a laqueo," which may only mean "taken away from the rope." This is however the view of the Schol. on the Farnese MS. ἤγουν ἤδη περιελημμένης τῆς δέρης τῇ ἀρτάνῃ. "Cum mihi invitæ manus injecissent," is a much better rendering, though the word probably agrees with δέρης, not with ἐμοῦ understood in ἐμῆς.

850. ἀμφίλεκτα πῆματα is clearly parallel to Soph. Ant. 111. νεικέων

ἐξ ἀμφιλόγων, Eurip. Phœn. 500. ἀμφίλεκτος ἔρις, quoted by Peile. Those who, like Paley, render it *mala utrimque prædicata*, and also consider βουλήν καταρρίψειεν to mean, as alone it can mean naturally, the overthrow of the senate, lay themselves open to Peile's and Linwood's objection that such an overthrow would not be what is meant by τὸν πεσόντα κ. τ. λ., which Wellauer can scarcely be held to have anticipated by saying that the βουλή, under which term he includes the government generally, are the πεσόντες. It is the danger attending the royal family when stripped of its power which those words must mean, and this has been previously expressed by ἀμφίλεκτα πῆματα, which are to arise *in the event* (εἴ τε κ. τ. λ.) of a popular insurrection. Against Peile's own interpretation of βουλήν καταρρίψειεν, which he supposes with Heath, Blomfield, and others, to mean *precipitating measures*, Paley

That others had to seize me oft and break  
 Ropes knotted from above about my neck.  
 'Tis thus our son is not beside us now  
 The holder of our pledges, mine and thine,  
 Orestes, as is meet: yet wonder not,  
 For he is living with a courteous friend,  
 Strophius the Phocian, who foretold to me  
 The mischief of disputes, and thine own peril  
 At Troy, and dangers, should the council fall  
 By popular anarchy, as mortals love  
 To spurn yet further those already down—  
 Such plea, I think, bears no deceit upon it.  
 But as for me, the gushing springs of tears  
 Have all been drained, nor is there left a drop.  
 And I have suffered with late-watching eyes,  
 Weeping, while torchlights for thy sake held up

Justly says "Qui vertunt *consilium* *projectum* inirent probare debent eodem sensu usurpatum esse *καταρρίψαι* quo *ἀναρρίψαι* de aleis dictum, ut Thuc. IV. 85. v. 103." The *βουλή* is the Chorus itself, the *μονόφρουρον ἔρκος* of v. 245, as Symmons says, though by the bye he there understood those words of Clytæmnestra.

859. An attempt has recently been made by Paley to establish Wellauer's interpretation of *τὰς ἀμφί σοι λαμπτ. κ. τ. λ.* "propter neglecta (sc. non incensa) signa captæ Trojæ" (from which Heath and Blomfield's "signa per incuriam non exhibita" differs only in a point of detail) by a sort of exhaustive process. He first rejects Scholefield's notion of disjoining *ἀμφί σοι* from *τὰς λαμπτ.*, which certainly cannot be sustained, and then proceeds "Quoniam igitur necesse est construere *τὰς ἀμφί σοι λαμπτ.* si quis eam quam cum Well. amplexus sum, interpretationem improbet, quorsum confugiendum? Scilicet ad candelas

noctu per palatium dispositas, si forte inopinato reditu superveniret Agamemno, quas illa præ dolore aut accendere diu neglexerat, aut accensas parum curaverat." I trust my translation will show, as those of Symmons and Peile might have shown before, that the interpretation to which we are driven is not so absurd as he supposes. It is not the arrangement of lamps in the palace in case of Agamemnon coming home suddenly, but the "light in the lonely tower," in Clytæmnestra's chamber, burning for her while all others are at rest, which we understand by *λαμπτηρουχίαι*; lights held up while she was watching for him, *ἀμφί σοι*. "The holding up of lamps" is not an improper expression, whether we think of what was probably the primitive custom, torches held up by slaves, or of the substitute which existed in the time of Homer, Od. VII. 100. *χρύσειοι κοῦροι, . . αἰθομένας δαΐδας μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχοντες*, "aurea juvenum simulacra . . . lampadas igniferas ma-



ἄτημελήτους αἶεν. ἐν δ' ὀνείρασιν, 860  
 λεπταῖς ὑπαὶ κώνωπος ἐξηγειρόμην  
 ῥιπαῖσι θωύσσοντος, ἀμφί σοι πάθη  
 ὀρώσα πλείω τοῦ ξυνεύδοντος χρόνου.  
 νῦν ταῦτα πάντα τλᾶσ' ἀπενθήτῳ φρενὶ  
 λέγοιμ' ἂν ἄνδρα τόνδε τῶν σταθμῶν κύνα, 865  
 σωτήρα ναὸς πρότονον, ὑψηλῆς στέγης  
 στύλον ποδῆρη, μονογενὲς τέκνον πατρὶ,  
 καὶ γῆν φανείσαν ναυτίλοις παρ' ἐλπίδα,  
 κάλλιστον ἦμαρ εἰσιδεῖν ἐκ χείματος,  
 ὁδοιπόρῳ διψῶντι πηγαῖον ῥέος· 870  
 τερπνὸν δὲ τὰναγκαῖον ἐκφυγεῖν ἅπαν.  
 τοιοῖσδε τοί νιν ἀξιῶ προσφθέγμασιν.  
 φθόνος δ' ἀπέστω· πολλὰ γὰρ τὰ πρὶν κακὰ  
 ἠνειχόμεσθα· νῦν δ' ἐμοῖ, φίλον κάρα,  
 ἔκβαιν' ἀπήνης τῆσδε, μὴ χαμαὶ τιθεῖς 875  
 τὸν σὸν πόδ', ὦ 'ναξ, Ἰλίου πορθήτορα.

nibus sententia dextris," as Lucretius renders it. But Paley further objects "exilis et jejuna ex hac explicatione evadit sententia, quæ minime accommodata esset ad totius sermonis tenorem." What? more meagre and jejune than what follows immediately afterwards, the buzzing of the gnat? Clytæmnestra is evidently painting a domestic scene, the mourning lady in her chamber, and the torches burning on unheeded form a natural part of such a picture, which would be entirely lost if we brought in the beacon-fires instead.

863. *ξυνεύδοντος*, the time is supposed to sleep with Clytæmnestra, like the moon with Endymion, yet still to retain its usual observation, so that while she sees her dreams, it sees what is going on in the waking world. For the expression, see on v. 107. The ellipse will then

be *πλείω ἢ ἑώρα ὁ ξυνεύδων χρόνος*; and this will give greater definiteness to the thought than if we were to understand it in the common way (which however may be right), "evils which would cover more than the space of time that slept with me, i. e. during which I slept."

864. The run of the verse tells, I think, against the punctuation followed by Paley, (and virtually by Dindorf, Peile, and Klausen, though the latter seems to have a notion of a kind of double connection), *νῦν, ταῦτα πάντα τλᾶσ', ἀπενθήτῳ φρενὶ λέγοιμ' ἂν*. *ἀπενθήτῳ* must then be taken with Blomfield, "dolori minime succumbens," or, as I have called it, "uncrushed," where the passive form *ἀπενθήτῳ* would denote a great deal more than *οὐ πενθούση*, which would not at all have expressed her meaning. It seems as if it might signify that grief had not



Were burning on neglected—and in dreams  
 Still was I wakened by the gentle flutter  
 Of the light-buzzing gnat, for thy dear sake  
 Seeing more evils than the time I slept.  
 Now, having borne all this with heart uncrushed,  
 I'd call my lord here watchdog of the door,  
 Mainrope that saves the ship, of lofty roof  
 Foundation pillar, father's only child,  
 Land looming forth to seamen past all hope,  
 Fairest of suns to look at after storm,  
 Clear fountain-spring to thirsty traveller:  
 Aye, for to 'scape from utmost need is sweet:  
 So with these titles I would honour him.  
 But jealousy, stand off: for many an ill  
 We have borne before: but now, my best loved lord,  
 Dismount from this thy car, nor set on earth  
 Thy foot, O king, the foot that trod down Troy.

mastered her and converted her nature into its own.

868. Not much can be said for the explanations which have been devised for "this offending *καὶ*," as Peile calls it. His own, "that it connects two proximate figures as coming more immediately under the same category, nay, as in fact identical," is mere special pleading, as no reason can be devised why land appearing to sailors past hope should be more closely allied to a man's only son than at least the two previous images. Klausen's explanation, that Clytæmnestra makes two classes of good things, like Aristotle's ἀγαθὰ, μείζω ἀγαθὰ, τίμα, ἐπαυτεῖα, and all the rest of them,—one of preventives, the other of cures, of which, contrary to the proverb, he makes the latter the better, is sufficiently ingenious, but not more likely to be true than a notion recently propounded, that St. Paul, in Philippians IV. 8, has given a sys-

tematic classification of our moral sentiments. If *καὶ* is to be accounted for at all, it may perhaps indicate that Clytæmnestra thought of winding up the catalogue with this line, but afterwards in her bounty, to show what a store of fine images she had at her command, added two more. The feeling would not be unlike that which dictated τὴν κάτω γὰρ οὐ λέγω.

871. *τερπνὸν δέ*. "Reddunt hæc rationem cur has appellationes cumulaverit et ipsa ficto lætitiæ impetu exclamantur. Deinde revertitur ad ipsas appellationes, eas contra invidiam defensura." Klausen. *τὰναγκαῖον* must have stress laid on it, as enhancing the pleasure of escape. "'Tis sweet to be delivered hard beset." Symmons. The position of *ἅπαν* seems to determine, what would otherwise be very doubtful, that it is to be connected closely with *ἐκφυγεῖν*.



δμωαὶ, τί μέλλεθ', αἷς ἐπέσταλται τέλος  
πέδον κελεύθου στρωννύναι πετάσμασιν ;  
εὐθὺς γενέσθω πορφυρόστρωτος πόρος,  
ἐς δῶμ' ἄελπτον ὥς ἂν ἡγήται δίκη.

880

τὰ δ' ἄλλα φροντὶς, οὐχ ὕπνῳ νικωμένη,  
θήσει δικαίως σὺν θεοῖς εἰμαρμένα.

ΑΓ. Λήδας γένεθλον, δωμάτων ἐμῶν φύλαξ,  
ἀπουσία μὲν εἰπας εἰκότως ἐμῇ·  
μακρὰν γὰρ ἐξέτεινας· ἀλλ' ἐναισίμῳς  
αἰνεῖν, παρ' ἄλλων χρὴ τόδ' ἔρχεσθαι γέρας.  
καὶ τᾶλλα, μὴ γυναικὸς ἐν τρόποις ἐμὲ  
ἄβρυνε, μηδὲ, βαρβάρου φωτὸς δίκην,  
χαμαιπετὲς βόαμα προσχάνης ἐμοί·  
μηδ' εἵμασι στρώσας' ἐπίφθονον πόρον  
τίθει. θεοὺς τοι τοῖσδε τιμαλφεῖν χρεῶν·  
ἐν ποικίλοις δὲ θνητὸν ὄντα κάλλεσιν  
βαίνειν, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐδαμῶς ἄνευ φόβου.  
λέγω κατ' ἄνδρα, μὴ θεὸν, σέβειν ἐμέ.  
χωρὶς ποδοψήστρων τε καὶ τῶν ποικίλων  
κληδὼν αὐτεῖ· καὶ τὸ μὴ κακῶς φρονεῖν,  
θεοῦ μέγιστον δῶρον. ὀλβίσαι δὲ χρὴ  
βίον τελευτήσαντ' ἐν εὖεστοῖ φίλῃ.  
εἰ πάντα δ' ὥς πράσσοιμ' ἂν, εὐθαρσῆς ἐγώ.

885

890

895

ΚΛ. καὶ μὴν τόδ' εἶπὲ μὴ παρὰ γνώμην ἐμοί.

900

ΑΓ. γνώμην μὲν ἴσθι μὴ διαφθεροῦντ' ἐμέ.

ΚΛ. εὗξω θεοῖς δείσας ἂν ὧδ' ἔρδειν τάδε.

880. I cannot help calling attention, though it has been frequently remarked by others, to the tremendous *εἰρωνεία* with which Clytemnestra concludes her speech, here and in v. 942.

885. *ἐναισίμῳς αἰνεῖν* is the infinitive denoting the effect, "in order that the praise may be just," not a

phrase in apposition with *γέρας*.

889. This line may give a specimen of the sort of position which I wish my translation to occupy. There is surely a sufficient medium between Sewell's "Gape thou upon me an earth-grovelling howl," which cannot be called English, and Symmons' version of the whole passage,

Slaves, why delay ye, who have had the charge  
 With tapestry to bespread the pathway's floor?  
 Swift be there made a passage purple-strown  
 That Justice to the unlooked-for home may guide him,  
 And for the rest, Thought, not by sleep subdued,  
 Shall set all right, as Heaven has ordered it.

AG. Daughter of Leda! guardian of my house!  
 Thy speaking to my absence answers well,  
 For thou hast spun it long; but for such praise  
 To come in season, it should come from others.  
 Moreover, seek not, as I were a woman,  
 To pamper me, nor, like barbarian folk,  
 Scream to me from the ground with open mouth,  
 Nor, strewing it with raiment, make my way  
 An envious thing. Such gifts are for the gods:  
 But for a mortal man like me to walk  
 On rich-stained fineries—I fear to do it.  
 No—honour me, I say, as man, not god.  
 Without these carpets and gay-coloured things  
 Fame's voice is heard: and not to be unwise  
 Is the best gift of Heaven. The man that ends  
 His life in fortune we may well call blest.  
 Could I speed always thus, I need not fear.

CLY. Still say not this against my judgment now.

AG. My judgment know that I will never spoil.

CLY. Thou must have vowed to Heaven in this, from fear.

*καὶ τίλλα, μὴ γυναικὸς, κ. τ. λ.*, though it breathes much of the spirit of our old dramatists;

Besides, pry'thee, use not too fond a care  
 To me, as to some virgin whom thou strivest  
 To deck with ornaments, whose softness looks  
 Softer hung round the softness of her youth.  
 Ope not the mouth to me, nor cry amain  
 As at the footstool of a man of the East  
 Prone on the ground: so stoop not thou to me.

899. Those who agree to the principles put forward on v. 308, and referred to on vv. 334, 410, and thus do not object to look at *εἰ* and the mood it takes after it separately, will see no difficulty in *εἰ πράσσοιμι* *ἄν*, however unusual as a matter of fact such a combination may be.  
 902. Wellauer, Klausen, and Din-dorf connect *ἄν* with *ἔρδειν*: Blom-

ΑΓ. εἵπερ τις, εἰδώς γ' εὖ τόδ' ἐξείπον τέλος.

ΚΛ. τί δ' ἂν δοκεῖ σοι Πρίαμος, εἰ τάδ' ἥνυσεν ;

ΑΓ. ἐν ποικίλοις ἂν κάρτα μοι βῆναι δοκεῖ.

905

ΚΛ. μή νυν τὸν ἀνθρώπειον αἰδεσθῆς ψόγον.

ΑΓ. φήμη γε μέντοι δημόθρους μέγα σθένει.

ΚΛ. ὁ δ' ἀφθόνητός γ' οὐκ ἐπίζηλος πέλει.

ΑΓ. οὗτοι γυναικός ἐστιν ἰμείρειν μάχης.

ΚΛ. τοῖς δ' ὀλβίοις γε καὶ τὸ νικᾶσθαι πρέπει.

910

ΑΓ. ἧ καὶ σὺ νίκην τήνδε δῆριος τίεις ;

ΚΛ. πιθοῦ· κράτος μέντοι πάρες γ' ἐκὼν ἐμοί.

ΑΓ. ἀλλ' εἰ δοκεῖ σοι ταῦθ', ὑπαί τις ἀρβύλας

λύοι τάχος, πρόδουλον ἔμβασιν ποδός,

σὺν τοῖσδέ μ' ἐμβαίνονθ' ἀλουργέσιν θεῶν

915

μή τις πρόσωθεν ὄμματος βάλοι φθόνος.

πολλή γὰρ αἰδώς δωματοφθορεῖν ποσὶν

φθείροντα πλοῦτον ἀργυρωνήτους θ' ὑφάς.

τούτων μὲν οὕτως· τὴν ξένην δὲ πρευμαίνω

field, Scholefield, Peile, and Paley with εὔξω. I rather incline to Haupt's "third course" of connecting it with δείσας, which the pronunciation of the verse seems to point out. Neither εὔξω nor ἔρδειν in the sense of "thou must have vowed to do" positively require ἂν: and joining it with the participle will show, as Haupt remarks, that the notion implied by the participle is that which is mainly hypothetical—"it would be from fear then." Those who object to εὔξω standing for εὔξω ἂν, though the past tense itself has clearly a conditional force, as in Soph. Elect. 1022, πάντα γὰρ κατειργάσω, may read the line interrogatively, still referring ἂν to δείσας. Peile, after translating ὧδ' ἔρδειν τάδε rightly, "to do this thus," refers back to his interpretation of οὕτως in v. 695 (see the note there), and wishes us to compare Hor. Sat. I. 2.

106. "positum sic tangere nolit," apparently meaning us to translate, "when it is settled just so," or "when it is just settled," a fancy which he has got from Buttmann; though nothing can be plainer than that *sic* refers to *ut* in the line before—"just as a hunter would follow a hare in deep snow, so when it is settled" (probably, stretched dead) "he would not touch it"—*sic* and *ut* implying that the principle is in each case the same, the love of sport.

906. "Quod Aeschylus scripserat ΑΙΔΕΣΘΕΙΣ quum et αἰδεσθεῖς et αἰδεσθῆς significare possit, rationi consentaneum est αἰδεσθῆς præferri." Dindorf.

915. σὺν τοῖσδε. Paley mentions an ingenious conjecture of Dobree's, ξυστοῖς δέ, but if, as we certainly must, we place no more than a comma after ποδός in the line before,

- AG. If e'er man did, I spoke from sober choice.  
 CLY. What think'st thou Priam had done, had he been victor?  
 AG. I think he would have walked on coloured robes.  
 CLY. Now, do not fear the censure of mankind.  
 AG. Still, common-bruited Fame has mighty power.  
 CLY. But none will emulate those whom no man envies.  
 AG. 'Tis not a woman's part to long for strife.  
 CLY. Aye, but defeat sits well on happy men.  
 AG. Dost thou too prize such victory in a feud?  
 CLY. Come, yield—give me the conquest with good grace.  
 AG. Well, if thou art resolved, let some one loose  
 These sandals with all speed, the proud steps' thrall,  
 Lest if I walk in them on this sea-grain,  
 Some jealous eye from Heaven afar should strike me ;  
 For 'twere great shame to riot, with one's feet  
 Spoiling the costly treasures of the looms.  
 Thus far of these : but for this stranger, kindly

It would be necessary to read *ἐν τοῖσι*. Still Paley's suspicion, that the omission of *σὺν τοῖσδε* would spoil the sense, as it was not walking on the purple simply, but walking on it in his sandals which would offend the gods, is scarcely well founded, as this would be sufficiently expressed by the *γὰρ*. If a man says "I will take off my shoes, lest the jealousy of Heaven should strike me for walking on the carpet," it is natural to conclude that the offensiveness of the act would be mitigated, if not altogether removed, by the taking off of the shoes. He has however given a conclusive argument against the old reading *σωματοφθορεῖν* in v. 917, (unless we understand it with Klausen to mean no more than *φθείρειν*, like *νέκταρ ἔωνοχύει*, which is not to the point, as *σωματοφθορεῖν* can hardly signify to destroy *with* the body,) since *γὰρ* shows a reason to be given for what precedes, and it is not "playing the

tenderling," as Peile calls it, which would in no way be promoted by keeping the sandals on, but committing wilful waste, of which Agamemnon is afraid. But this does not prove that we must read *στρωματοφθορεῖν*, a word which would render the rest of the sentence mere tautology, in so much that Dindorf wishes to read *πατοῦντα* for *φθείροντα*. *Δωματοφθορεῖν*, Schutz's correction, gives a new thought, and one to which Clytæmnestra markedly refers in her reply, vv. 930, 1.—I have preserved *τοῖσδε*, "these things," since Æschylus may, as Peile observes, have avoided using *ταῖσδε*, the natural word after *ἀρβύλας*, for fear of a confusion with *ἀλουργέσιν*. For *μὴ βάλοι*, which Blomfield would change into *βάλῃ*, see the end of the note on v. 308.

919. *τούτων μὲν οὕτως. ταῦτ' οὖν μὲν οὕτως.* Schutz. *τοῦμόν μὲν οὕτως.* Emper, quoted by Dindorf: but the Greeks, equally with ourselves, some-

τὴνδ' ἐσκόμιζε. τὸν κρατοῦντα μαλθακῶς 920  
 θεὸς πρόσωθεν εὐμενῶς προσδέρκεται.  
 ἐκὼν γὰρ οὔδεις δουλίῳ χρήται ζυγῷ.  
 αὕτη δέ, πολλῶν χρημάτων ἐξαίρετον  
 ἄνθος, στρατοῦ δώρημ', ἐμοὶ ξυνέσπετο.  
 ἐπεὶ δ' ἀκούειν σου κατέστραμμαι τάδε, 925  
 εἴμ' ἐς δόμων μέλαθρα πορφύρας πατῶν.

ΚΛ. ἔστιν θάλασσα—τίς δέ νιν κατασβέσει;—  
 τρέφουσα πολλῆς πορφύρας ἰσάργυρον  
 κηκίδα παγκαίνιστον, εἰμάτων βαφάς.  
 οἶκος δ' ὑπάρχει τῶνδε σὺν θεοῖς, ἄναξ, 930  
 ἔχειν· πένεσθαι δ' οὐκ ἐπίσταται δόμος.  
 πολλῶν πατησμὸν δ' εἰμάτων ἂν εὐξάμην,  
 δόμοισι προὔνεχθέντος ἐν χρηστηρίοις,  
 ψυχῆς κόμιστρα τῆσδε μηχανωμένη.  
 ῥίζης γὰρ οὔσης, φυλλὰς ἵκετ' ἐς δόμους, 935  
 σκιὰν ὑπερτείνασα Σειρίου κυνός.  
 καὶ σοῦ μολόντος δωματίτιν ἐστίαν,

times gave a substantive force to οὕτως, so much. So Eurip. Phœr. 361. οὕτω δὲ τάρβους εἰς φόβον τ' ἀφικόμεν, where some have doubted the text in like manner. The genitive of relation, "with respect to this," comes to the same thing.

929. παγκαίνιστον. δὲ πάντες καινίζουσιν δύνανται.

930. Peile's οἶκος ὑπάρχει τῶνδε, "there is a houseful of these things," can hardly be defended, and the interpretation quoted by Klausen from Bernhardt (Synt. p. 168) "est horum, i. e. est nostrum," will still less bear examination. Porson's οἴκοις δ' ὑπάρχει is no real improvement, as it does not appear that ὑπάρχει ever means *satis est* (the examples given by Liddell and Scott can all be otherwise explained), and if τῶνδε has still to be taken with ἔχειν, very

little is gained by making ὑπάρχει impersonal. Klausen thinks that ὑπάρχει may mean both *suppeditat* and *suppetit*, and this, though involving a wrong notion, confirmed by an unauthorized interpretation of Soph. Elect. 919, and not helping him to dispose of τῶνδε, seems to come nearer the truth. Ἀρχειν takes a genitive after it, meaning either to *rule* or to *begin*: ὑπάρχειν τινος also occurs frequently in the latter sense, whence it comes generally to mean *auctor esse*. "To begin or cause a thing from beneath" would seem to be the strict meaning, the notion being derived from a tree shooting up, or from a foundation on which a building rises, as the word ὑπαρχον for an actual circumstance or a position laid down plainly indicates. ὑπάρχειν thus becomes equivalent to

Receive her in. The man that gently rules  
 Heaven from afar regards with favouring eyes,  
 For none seeks slavery that can help himself.  
 And she, the chosen flower of many spoils,  
 Was given me by the host, and followed me.  
 But, since I am bent to hear thy words herein,  
 I will walk toward my palace on the purple.

CLY. There is the sea——and who shall drain it dry?—  
 Maturing of much purple silver-worth  
 Drops ever new, the dying of rich robes.  
 Of such our mansion, under Heaven, my lord,  
 May boast good store:—it knows not ought of want.  
 I would have vowed the trampling of much raiment,  
 Had one proposed it at the oracle,  
 So might I have brought back this life of thine.  
 Save but the root, and foliage o'er the house  
 Springs, rearing up a screen from Sirius' rays;  
 And now that thou hast reached thine own home's  
 hearth,

the Latin *sufficio*, to *supply*, where the image is of sending up or causing to appear from beneath. Here then the sense will be, "But we have a house that supplies these things for us to have." *οἶκος* might give the same meaning, "there is one that supplies these things to our house;" but this is of course quite unnecessary.

933. Butler (*curæ secundæ*) is probably right in separating *χρηστηρίοις* from *δόμοισι*, which may very well be taken with *προὔνεχθέντος*, the constructions *προὔνεχθέντος δόμοις ἐκ χρηστηρίων*, and *π. ἐν χρηστηρίοις* being mixed. *προφέρειν* will then be "to send the charge from the oracle home," as *φέρειν φάτιν* is frequently used. There is no need to understand *πατησμοῦ*, as it is easy to make *προὔνεχθέντος* impersonal.—I have however kept the old sense of *προὔνεχθέντος* in my translation, as I am

not sure whether it may not be after all the best.

934. *μηχανωμένης*, the old reading, is out of the question. Klausen connects it with *ψυχῆς*, which yields a sufficiently forced sense. Paley with *ἐμοῦ*, observing, "*nihil fere frequentius quam genitivus in tali loco positus:*" but though the genitive absolute is sometimes used harshly in *Æschylus* (see on v. 674), it may well be doubted whether another instance can be shown where it occurs where so much confusion would be caused by the several genitives as here, and where moreover there has already been another genitive absolute in the preceding clause.

937. *σοῦ μολόντος* may be added to the list on v. 674 just alluded to. *μόλον*, Blomfield's conjecture, is confirmed by *σημαίνει μόλον* v. 282, and by the sense of the passage, as *ση-*

θάλπος μὲν ἐν χειμῶνι σημαίνεις μολόν.  
 ὅταν δὲ τεύχη Ζεὺς τ' ἀπ' ὄμφακος πικρᾶς  
 οἶνον, τότε ἤδη ψῦχος ἐν δόμοις πέλει,  
 ἀνδρὸς τελείου δῶμ' ἐπιστρωφωμένου.  
 Ζεῦ, Ζεῦ τέλειε, τὰς ἐμὰς εὐχὰς τέλει.  
 μέλοι δέ τοι σοὶ τῶνπερ ἂν μέλλης τελεῖν.

940

ΧΟ. τίπτε μοι τόδ' ἐμπέδως

στρ. α'.

δεῖμα προστατήριον

945

καρδίας τερασκόπου ποτᾶται,

μαντιπολεῖ δ' ἀκέλευστος, ἄμισθος αἰοιδά,

οὐδ' ἀποπτύσαν, δίκαν

δυσκρίτων ὄνειράτων,

θάρσος εὐπιθὲς ἵζει

950

φρενὸς φίλον θρόνον; χρόνος δ' ἐπεὶ

μαίνω hardly means *to symbolize*, and it was not the heat, but the coming of the heat that Agamemnon *declared*.

941. I have translated *τελείου* simply *perfect*, like Symmons' *a man in prime*, though I am aware Peile's *married* and Klausen's *crowning all* may each be amply supported.

945. *δεῖγμα* is less probable than Scaliger's correction *δεῖμα*, received by Blomfield and Dindorf, as throughout the ode the chorus does not speak of a vision, but of a vague feeling of terror. Klausen says justly "τόδε δεῖγμα certi aliquid habere debet quod respiciat." Accordingly he applies it to the memory of the past, as described in v. 951 sqq.: but what is there in those words to excite horror? there is no allusion to the sacrifice of Iphigenia, which would surely have been indicated "apertius tectius," had it formed a link, or rather the principal link, in the chain of gloomy thoughts. All that is there meant is, "They went away long ago, I remember the scene well; now they are returned,

as my eyes tell me: yet instead of feeling as I should do towards friends after a ten years' absence, my heart is oppressed with an undefined and objectless sense of evil."

946. "Verba ἐμπέδως, προστατήριον, stabilitatem plane indicantia, spectare videntur ad statuum basi impositam, quæ metaphora temperatur et exercetur contrario verbo ποτᾶται." Paley.

948. Peile's account of *ἀποπτύσας* can hardly stand, as ἐγὼ has no where appeared as a nominative in the sentence, so that it would not express "I having abominated," or agree with ἐγὼ more than with any other masculine noun or pronoun. *ἀποπτύσαι* adopted by Klausen and Paley from Triclinius, or the Farnese MS., which rests mainly on his authority, is awkward, as confidence could not well be said to sit on the throne of the heart in order to reject gloomy thoughts. *ἀποπτύσαν*, Casaubon's reading, has been received by Pauw, Porson, Blomfield, and Dindorf. *δίκαν* Klausen labours to interpret "the nature," as an ac-



Thy coming shows like heat in winter cold :  
 And when from the sour grape Zeus sheds the wine,  
 Then coolness reigns already in the house,  
 Now 'neath its roof its perfect master treads.  
 Zeus ! thou art perfect : perfect thou my prayers,  
 And have a care of all thou mean'st to perfect.

CHO.       Wherefore is this constant fear,  
               Ever, ever hovering near,  
 Still before my augurous bosom flitting ?  
 There murmurs an unpaid, unbidden song,  
               Nor, rejecting it with scorn,  
               Like vain dreams of slumber born,  
               Is happy boldness sitting  
 Upon my heart's dear throne.—The time is long

Cusative after ἀποπτύσαι : but it is more reasonable to suppose the meaning to be “rejecting them after the fashion of dreams,” than “rejecting the fashion of dreams.”

951. In considering an obscure passage like this, the first thing to be done is to reject such interpretations or emendations as seem plainly untenable, that we may afterwards see better what those are between which the probability lies. παρήβησεν cannot refer to χρόνος, with ἐπεὶ κτλ. intervening ; nor can we suppose with Klausen that the construction is ἐπεὶ δὲ χρόνος παρ., as, besides the awkward inversion, δὲ would have no meaning, or the sentence no apodosis. Paley, by reading ἐπὶ from the Farnese MS. has cleared these obstacles away : still παρήβησεν χρόνος would be a cumbrous expression to denote merely “long time has passed.” Linwood ingeniously makes θράσος the nominative, but the expression θράσος παρήβησεν would be rather a strange one, and the Chorus would hardly say that its confidence had fled from the time of the departure of the army, as the δύσφρον στύγος did not arise till afterwards,

when the absence was greatly prolonged, and the evils at home began to develop themselves. It remains then only to refer it with Peile to στρατός, (unless the passage be altered,) comparing v. 189. As to conjectures, Heath gives us παρήψεν, Blomfield ξυνεμβολαὶ παρήβησαν : but the best is Symmons' παρέδησεν, which would necessitate no further change in the common text except ξυνεμβολαῖς for ξυνεμβόλοις, (which in any case must be altered, as a vox nihili,) and perhaps ἀκάτους for ἀκάτας, after Bothe, though this Paley defends. Keeping παρήβησεν, we cannot well avoid reading ψαμμίας ἀκτᾶς with Wellauer, whether we proceed to adopt with him Casaubon's ξὺν ἐμβολαῖς, or, like Peile, are content with ξυνεμβολαῖς. And this last course is probably the best, as παρήβησεν is not likely to have been introduced by a transcriber, and ψαμμιαί ἀκάται cannot very naturally be brought to mean “the ships drawn up on the sand,” as Butler thinks, unless we can suppose *naves arenosæ* or *sandy vessels* to be susceptible of the same sense.



πρυμνησίων ξυνεμβολαῖς  
 ψαμμίας ἀκτᾶς παρή-  
 βησεν, εὖθ' ὑπ' Ἴλιον  
 ὦρτο, ναυβάτας στρατός. 955  
 πεύθομαι δ' ἀπ' ὀμμάτων  
 νόστον, αὐτόμαρτυς ὦν·  
 τὸν δ' ἄνευ λύρας ὅμως ὑμνωδεῖ  
 θρῆνον Ἑρινύος αὐτοδίδακτος ἔσωθεν  
 θυμὸς, οὐ τὸ πᾶν ἔχων 960  
 ἐλπίδος φίλον θράσος.  
 σπλάγχνα δ' οὔτι ματάζει,  
 πρὸς ἐνδίοις φρεσὶν τελεσφόροις  
 δίναις κυκλούμενον κέαρ.  
 εὔχομαι δὲ τάδ' ἐξ ἐμᾶς 965  
 ἐλπίδος ψύθη πεσεῖν  
 ἐς τὸ μὴ τελεσφόρον.  
  
 μάλα γέ τοι τὸ τᾶς πολλᾶς ὑγείας  
 ἀκόρεστον \* τέρμα· νόσος γὰρ  
 γείτων ὁμότοιχος ἐρείδει, 970  
 καὶ πότμος εὐθυπορῶν  
 ἀνδρὸς \* \* \* \* \*  
 \* \* ἔπαισεν ἄφαντον ἔρμα.  
 καὶ τὸ μὲν πρὸ χρημάτων  
 κτησίων ὄκνος βαλὼν 975  
 σφενδόνας ἀπ' εὐμέτρου,

962. Paley has a very good note here, discriminating the physical meaning of the several words, σπλάγχνα not being equivalent to ἔντερα, but referring, as *viscera* frequently does, to the heart, lungs, liver, &c.: so that κέαρ may well be understood with Klausen as standing in apposition to it, while φρένες are the midriff or diaphragm. The Greeks

were sufficiently materialists to use strictly physical terms when the various parts of the mind were spoken of, supposing one part to be the seat of the affections, another of the intellect, &c. Compare Eum. 153. ὑπὸ φρένας, ὑπὸ λοβόν.

965. εὔχομαι δὲ τάδ' ἐξ ἐμᾶς, extracted by Peile from the reading of the Florentine MS., is the best sug-

Since with many a cable's cast  
 In the sand embedded fast,  
 Languished here our armament,  
 When on Ilion it was bent.  
 Now from these my eyes I learn  
 Proof myself of their return :  
 Still the Erinnys' hymn is singing plainly  
 From my self-tutored mind a lyreless sound,  
 While in vain I grasp the whole  
 Of good confidence of soul.  
 Nor yearn my bowels vainly  
 Now as my heart is whirling round and round  
 'Gainst my boding breast withal.  
 But I pray that this may fall  
 False to my presaging thought  
 Into the blank void of nought.

For in sooth the bound of excessive health  
 Is encroaching ever : for near disease  
 Pushes hard the partition wall ;  
 And the vessel of human wealth  
 Fair sailing before the breeze  
 On invisible rocks will fall—  
 Yet when fear into the wave  
 Flings a part, the rest to save,  
 Casting from a moderate draught,

gestion which has been made in the place of εὔχομαι δ' ἀπ' ἐμᾶς τι.

968. I have followed Peile and Paley in reading μάλα γέ τοι τὸ τᾶς πολλᾶς, as the most probable in the existing state of the text. As however I believe πεσὸν ἀπαξ is the right reading in the antistrophe, so as to give 3 Pæon feet successively, I wish there were any authority for reading here μάλα γέ τοι τὸ πολέας, πολέας being the genitive feminine (for πολείας) of πολὺς, πολέος, of which we have πολέα above, v. 700.

πολεῖ probably in Suppl. 745, and πολέων Eurip. Hel. 1352. Again I have printed v. 972 as Peile has, having no opinion myself one way or the other.

974. τὸ μὲν, as Klausen remarks, answers to τὸ δὲ, v. 983, though they are not on that account to be construed "on the one hand" and "on the other," as the article has in each case a meaning of its own, here going after βαλὼν, there along with πεσόν.

οὐκ ἔδν πρόπας δόμος,  
πημονᾶς γέμων ἄγαν,  
οὐδ' ἐπόντισε σκάφος.

πολλά τοι δόσις

980

ἐκ Διὸς ἀμφιλαφῆς τε καὶ ἐξ ἀλόκων ἐπετειᾶν  
νῆστιν ὤλεσεν νόσον.

τὸ δ' ἐπὶ γᾶν πεσὸν ἄπαξ θανάσιμον

ἀντ. β.

προπάροιθ' ἀνδρὸς μέλαν αἶμα τίς ἂν

πάλιν ἀγκαλέσαιτ' ἐπαείδων ;

985

οὐδὲ τὸν ὀρθοδαῆ

τῶν φθιμένων ἀνάγειν

Ζεὺς ἂν ἔπαυσεν ἐπ' εὐλαβείᾳ.

εἰ δὲ μὴ τεταγμένα

μοῖρα μοῖραν ἐκ θεῶν

990

εἶργε μὴ πλέον φέρειν,

προφθάσασα καρδία

977. I have translated as if the text were οὐκ ἔδυσε δόμον, οὐδ' ἐπόντισε : but the construction clearly is, as Peile has pointed out, οὐκ ἔδν δόμος οὐδὲ (δόμος) ἐπόντισε.

980. "πολλά est pro πολλή, ut Theb. 354, quod docet metrum antistrophicum. Male Peile explicat sæpe." Paley.

983. Those who support τὸ τᾶς πολλᾶς in v. 968, will find Bothe's singular reading πεσὸν θάπαξ (i. e. τὸ ἄπαξ) more metrical than Porson's ἄπαξ πεσὸν, and much more like the original text, πεσόνθ' ἄπαξ. In reading πεσὸν ἄπαξ we need not be greatly concerned to account for πεσόνθ' ; or, if we choose to do so, θάπαξ may have arisen from θανάσιμον without πεσὸν having ever stood any where but where we find it in the MSS.

988. Klausen's ἀνέπαυσεν yields no very desirable meaning, whether followed by ἐπ' εὐλαβείᾳ in the sense of

cunctanter, or by ἐπ' ἀβλαβείᾳ, the reading of the Farn. MS. Wellauer's forced connection of ἀβλαβείᾳ with ἀνάγειν, Blomfield's yet more violent transposition of the words, are sufficiently selfcondemnatory.—ἂν ἔπαυσεν ἐπ' εὐλαβείᾳ, as Peile reads, introducing ἂν, after Hermann, and omitting αὐτ', is probably correct ; and such is the opinion of Paley, who inserts it in the text. Canter first proposed to omit ἐπ' εὐλαβείᾳ or ἐπ' εὐλαβείᾳ γε altogether, in which he was followed by almost every editor till Blomfield. Following this out, agreeably to the principle laid down by Dyer in his Tentamina, that what are supposed to be lacunæ in the Choral odes generally arise from unauthorized insertions in the corresponding strophe or antistrophe, we may bring the text down to the metre of v. 972, as it will stand if no omission be supposed, by reading οὐδὲ τὸν ὀρθοδαῆ τῶν φθιμένων ἀνάγειν

Oft he loses not his craft  
 Though with sorrow teeming full,  
 Nor o'erwhelms the good ship's hull.  
 Many a gift from Zeus commanded,  
 Mighty and two-handed,  
 Yielded in plenty by the year's increase,  
 Bids the plague of famine cease.  
 But the blood that once upon earth has dropped  
 At a man's own feet, who can e'er restore  
 By singing or muttered spell?  
 Else wherefore should Zeus have stopped  
 The man who could bring once more  
 The dead into life from hell?—  
 But if fate from Heaven ordained  
 Had not this my fate restrained  
 From affording succour long,  
 Then my heart before my tongue  
 Running, had poured out the tale,

ἐπαυσεν; "Was there not one who stopped him who could raise men from the dead?" But I prefer Peile's reading, as well for other reasons as for that which Klausen has pointed out, that ἐπαυσεν seems to be meant to correspond to ἐπαισεν in the strophe.

989. I agree with Symmons in taking μοῖρα for the superior fate in the hands of Heaven, μοῖραν for the fateful bodings of the Chorus' own mind, as being more in keeping with the general tone of the Ode than the explanations which others have devised. The order is perhaps against joining ἐκ θεῶν with τεταγμένα, yet it is not to be taken with μοῖραν, which would rather require τὴν ἐκ θ., but connected generally with εἶργε. Symmons is however probably wrong in rendering φέρειν *sapere*, and comparing Soph. Œd. T. 500 (in both of which he is followed by Butler, *curæ secundæ*), as

the sense seems to be generally, "carrying things further," whether the figure be that of bringing help, or extending boundaries.

992. προφθάσασα. I cannot help thinking that this word, in the form of the present participle, is to be introduced into that very corrupt passage, Choeph. 415—417, ὅταν δ' αὐτ' ἐπαλκὲς θραρε' (read τότε ἂν δ' εὐτ' ἐπαλκῆς ἄραρεν, where τότε ἂν is from Blomfield, with whom we may also read ἐπ' ἀλκῆς)... (Blomfield probably supplies ἐλπίς) ἀπέστασεν ἄχος πρὸς τὸ φανείσθαι (read προφθάνουσα, sc. ἄχος) μοι καλῶς. Προσφανείσα has been proposed, but the word does not seem to occur. In the strophe I would read with Blomfield κραδίας for καρδίας, v. 391. (It might also be proposed to read ὅταν δ' αὐτ' ἐπ' ἀλκῆς ἀράρη, which would only involve the confusion of ΑΡΑΡΕΙ, as Æschylus would have written the word, with ΘΡΑΡΕ. ἐπ' ἀλκῆς seems

γλώσσαν ἂν τάδ' ἐξέχει.  
 νῦν δ' ὑπὸ σκότῳ βρέμει  
 θυμαλγῆς τε, καὶ  
 οὐδὲν ἐπελπομένα ποτὲ καίριον ἐκτολυπεύσειν,  
 ζωπυρουμένας φρενός.

995

## ΚΛΥΤΑΙΜΝΗΣΤΡΑ.

εἴσω κομίζου καὶ σύ· Κασάνδραν λέγω·  
 ἐπεὶ σ' ἔθηκε Ζεὺς ἀμηνίτως δόμοις  
 κοινωνὸν εἶναι χερνίβων, πολλῶν μέτα  
 δούλων, σταθεῖσαν κτησίου βωμοῦ πέλας.  
 ἔκβαιν' ἀπήνης τῆσδε· μηδ' ὑπερφρόνει.  
 καὶ παῖδα γάρ τοι φασὶν Ἀλκμήνης ποτὲ  
 πραθέντα τλῆναι, καὶ ζυγῶν θιγεῖν βία.  
 εἰ δ' οὖν ἀνάγκη τῆσδ' ἐπιρρέποι τύχης,  
 ἀρχαιοπλούτων δεσποτῶν πολλὴ χάρις·  
 οἱ δ', οὔ ποτ' ἐλπίσαντες, ἤμησαν καλῶς,  
 ὡμοί τε δούλοις πάντα καὶ παρὰ στάθμην.  
 ἔχεις παρ' ἡμῶν οἷά περ νομίζεται.

1000

1005

ΧΟ. σοί τοι λέγουσα παύεται σαφῇ λόγον.  
 ἐντὸς δ' ἂν οὔσα μορσίμων ἀγρευμάτων,  
 πείθοι' ἂν, εἰ πείθοι'· ἀπειθοίης δ' ἴσως.

1010

ΚΛ. ἀλλ' εἵπερ ἐστὶ μὴ, χελιδόνος δίκην,  
 ἀγνώτα φωνὴν βάρβαρον κεκτημένη,

better than ἐπάλκης, which is found nowhere else.)

999. It might be doubted whether ἀμηνίτως referred to the absence of anger on the part of either Cassandra or her masters (to one or other of which senses Klausen and Peile agree, the latter rendering "all anger being dropped between us") or to the merciful intentions of Zeus, as Wellauer takes it, if the order did not point out the latter. Haupt indeed thinks the order conclusive in favour of the former, but

this would oblige us to connect, as Peile and Paley recommend, δόμοις with κοινωνὸν, "partaker with the family," whereas it clearly belongs to ἔθηκε. πολλῶν μέτα δούλων, which may go indifferently with the words preceding and those following it, expresses the persons whose lot Cassandra is to share.

1005. See on v. 657. Peile rightly remarks that the intermediate thought is contained in the word βία.

1011. Haupt's ἀλοῦσα for ἂν οὔσα

Now within night's gloomy pale,  
Loud it roars in inward travail,  
Hoping not to unravel  
To timely purpose the entangled maze,  
While my soul is all ablaze.

CLYTÆMNESTRA.

Thou too betake thee in—I mean Cassandra,  
Since Zeus with no harsh mind hath placed thee here  
With many slaves to share in our ablutions,  
Taking thy station near the household altar.  
Come, leave this car, and be not proud of heart.  
Why, say they not Alcmena's son was brought  
Once, to be sold, and feel the yoke perforce?  
And, if such fortune needs must fill thy scale,  
To have masters old in wealth is mighty gain:  
But those who have reaped well, with no such hopes,  
Are harsh to slaves and ever in excess.  
Thou hast from us such welcome as is wont.

CHO. To *thee* she now stops speaking—a clear speech.  
Now, as thou liest within the toils of fate,  
Obey her, if thou would'st—perchance thou would'st not.

CLY. Nay, if so be she is not, like a swallow,  
Mistress of an unknown barbarian tongue,

is very ingenious; but beside that it would be scarcely correct, as ἐντός ἀγρωμάτων applies rather to the state of lying a captive than to the act of being caught, in his interpretation of v. 902 he has abundantly vindicated the use of ἄν with a participle; and indeed here he thinks “indiget hic locus explicatione non correctione.” ἀπειθοίης has of course perplexed those who think ἄν entirely changes the sense of the optative. They are mostly inclined to borrow ἄν from the words preceding, where, as in Soph. Œd. T. 937, there seems to be enough and to spare: but except so far as it is

included in Paley's sensible remark, “quum nobis satis persuasum sit Atticos non dubitavisse etiam sine ἄν usurpare optativum, rationi consentaneum videtur vel facilius id fieri sicubi proxime præcesserit ea particula,” such a process appears to be unsatisfactory and superfluous. Elmsley's remark that ἴσως stands for ἄν is true so far as it shews that ἄν is not indispensable: but it should have been generalized, to the effect that it is the context, not merely the presence or absence of the conditional particle, which determines whether the optative is to express a hypothesis or a wish.

ἔσω φρενῶν λέγουσα πείθω νιν λόγῳ.

1015

ΧΟ. ἔπου· τὰ λῶστα τῶν παρεστῶτων λέγει.

πείθου, λιποῦσα τόνδ' ἀμαξήρη θρόνον.

ΚΛ. οὗτοι θυραίαν τήνδ' ἐμοὶ σχολὴ πάρα  
τρίβειν· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἐστίας μεσομφάλου

ἔστηκεν ἤδη μῆλα πρὸς σφαγὰς πυρὸς,

1020

ὥς οὐποτ' ἐλπίσασι τήνδ' ἔξειν χάριν.

σὺ δ' εἴ τι δράσεις τῶνδε, μὴ σχολὴν τίθει·

εἰ δ', ἀξυνήμων οὔσα, μὴ δέχει λόγον,

σὺ δ' ἀντὶ φωνῆς φράζε καρβάνῳ χερί.

ΧΟ. ἐρμηνέως ἔοικεν ἡ ξένη τοροῦ

1025

δεῖσθαι· τρόπος δὲ θηρὸς ὡς νεαυρέτου.

ΚΛ. ἡ μαίνεται γέ καὶ κακῶν κλύει φρενῶν,

ἥτις λιποῦσα μὲν πόλιν νεαίρετον

ἥκει, χαλινὸν δ' οὐκ ἐπίσταται φέρειν,

πρὶν αἱματηρὸν ἐξαφρίζεσθαι μένος.

1030

οὐ μὲν πλέω ρίψας ἀτιμωθήσομαι.

1015. "Versus corruptus." Din-dorf. "Non credo." Paley. If there be any corruption, it does not seem to lie in πείθω, for which Elmsley would read πείθε. ἔσω φρενῶν is more difficult, though the φρενές are certainly those of Cassandra, as Klausen's note and quotation are nothing to the purpose. It is probably merely a variation of the ordinary expressions, such as "words entering into the mind," &c. But it is just conceivable that the original reading may have been something like εὖ σωφρονεῖν λέγουσα, just as σωφρονεῖν εἰρημένον is used in v. 1591.

1018. θυραίαν τήνδε must be understood with Scholefield and Peile, *hic ante fores*. The accusative is the natural case here, as the notion of θυραία does not belong to ἐμοὶ generally, but to ἐμέ after τρίβειν, the meaning not being "for me who am before the doors, to wait," but

"for me to wait before the doors;" so that if the text gave θυραία, as Casaubon proposed, we should have to take it as put by attraction for θυραίαν, like "da justo sanctoque videri." τήνδε again is quite proper here, as showing the intermediate stage through which ὅδε is transferred from some other person close to the speaker, or in the speaker's mind, to the speaker himself. When a man looks at himself as standing on the very spot in question, he naturally calls himself ὅδε; and thus ὅδε comes to be used as synonymous with ἐγὼ where no such local view is taken. τήνδε then has here a propriety which ἐμέ would not have had, even if it could have been used without inelegance so immediately before ἐμοί. This explanation may seem harsh, as it undoubtedly is not obvious at first sight: but it is at least better than the others which

Thus speaking to her mind, I needs must move her.

CHO. O follow her! thou canst have no better counsel;  
Comply, and leave this chariot-seat of thine.

CLY. Nay, I have no leisure to be waiting here  
Before the doors: while by the central hearth  
The victims stand for butchery at the fire,  
As we ne'er hoped to see so glad a day.  
Well, if thou wilt do ought of this, be quick,  
Or, if thy ignorance knows not what I say,  
At least for voice speak with thy barbarous hand.

CHO. Some clear interpreter the stranger seems  
To want: her way is like a beast's new caught.

CLY. Aye, sure she's mad and follows her wild will,  
She that has left a newly taken town  
And now comes here, yet cannot bear the curb,  
Till she has foamed away her bloody rage.  
Well, I'll not spend more words, thus to be scorned.

have been brought forward, e. g. Klausen's *παρὰ τήνδε* (Cassandram) *θυραίαν*, Paley's *τρίβειν θυραίαν παρὰ τήνδε*, Haupt's *θυραίαν τρίβειν τήνδε* (*verbis hancce tractare*), or that which he ultimately prefers from Bernhardt, *τρίβειν τήνδε θυραίαν*, sc. *τρίβην*, on the authority of *τρίτην ἐπενδίδωμι* v. 1353 and *ζεύξω βαρείας* v. 1611.

1019. *τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἐστίας*. "for as regards the family altar," Peile, who admits also that *τὰ* may be joined with *μῆλα*, as Paley joins them, "the victims of the central hearth." A better explanation than either would be to suppose that Clytæmnestra speaks first generally and then corrects herself by specifying, "For the things belonging to the central hearth . . . the victims are placed already."

1024. This has been called a good example of a classical bull: and the absurdity is not removed by supposing Clytæmnestra to suit the action to the word, as in that case why should she speak at all? The

natural thing would have been, if the spectators were to be apprised of what she meant to do, that she should address the Chorus; and so Sewell appears to think; indeed he supposes that she actually does so as the text stands, referring *σὺ δὲ* to the Chorus, which can never be after *δέχει* immediately preceding, and rendering *καρβάνῳ χέρι* "interpret hand," words not English in themselves, and entirely misrepresenting the Greek. Klausen's defence, "etsi enim concinnam orationem male intellexisset Cassandra, non poterat non scire multa verba singula et ita eorum quæ nunc dicit regina, sensum percipere," is very weak. The context evidently points to a total want of comprehension, the alternative which Clytæmnestra has before mentioned in vv. 1013, 14.

1027. "*κλύειν*. regi, obedire. Eadem metaphorica ratione Suppl. 717. *πρώρα οἶακος κλύουσα*." Klausen.



ΧΟ. ἐγὼ δ', ἐποικτείρω γὰρ, οὐ θυμώσομαι.  
ἴθ', ὦ τάλαινα, τόνδ' ἐρημώσας ὄχον,  
εἵκουσ' ἀνάγκη τῇδε καίνισον ζυγόν.

## ΚΑΣΑΝΔΡΑ.

ὅτοτοτοτοί, πόποι, δᾶ.

στρ. α'.

ὦ ἄπολλον, ὦ ἄπολλον.

1036

ΧΟ. τί ταῦτ' ἀνωτότυξας ἀμφὶ Λοξίου;  
οὐ γὰρ τοιοῦτος ὥστε θρηνητοῦ τυχεῖν.

ΚΑ. ὅτοτοτοτοί, πόποι, δᾶ.

ἀντ. α'.

ὦ ἄπολλον, ὦ ἄπολλον.

1040

ΧΟ. ἥδ' αὖτε δυσφημοῦσα τὸν θεὸν καλεῖ,  
οὐδὲν προσήκοντ' ἐν γόοις παραστατεῖν.

ΚΑ. Ἄπολλον, Ἄπολλον,

στρ. β'.

ἀγυιάτ', ἀπόλλων ἐμός.

ἀπώλεσας γὰρ οὐ μόλις τὸ δεύτερον.

1045

ΧΟ. χρήσειν ἔοικεν ἀμφὶ τῶν αὐτῆς κακῶν.  
μένει τὸ θεῖον, δουλία περ ἐν φρενί.

ΚΑ. Ἄπολλον, Ἄπολλον,

ἀντ. β'.

ἀγυιάτ', ἀπόλλων ἐμός.

ἄ, ποῖ ποτ' ἤγαγές με; πρὸς ποίαν στέγην;

1050

ΧΟ. πρὸς τὴν Ἀτρειδῶν· εἰ σὺ μὴ τόδ' ἐννοεῖς,  
ἐγὼ λέγω σοι· καὶ τὰδ' οὐκ ἐρεῖς ψύθη.

ΚΑ. ἄ ἄ.

μισόθεον μὲν οὖν, πολλὰ συνίστορα

1034. *καίνιζω* is "to use for the first time," a sense which the editors agree in giving to it here, though in Choeph. 492, which several of them compare, they understand it more or less differently. Whether we there read ὡς ἐκαίνισαν or ᾧ σ' ἐκαίνισαν, we must not understand it of the strange use to which the net was put, but of the net conceived of as a *new garment*, provided for Aga-

memnon on his return by Clytæmnestra, as Deianira in Soph. Trachin. provides the tunic for Hercules, that he may appear *θυτῆρα καινῶ καινὸν ἐν πεπλώματι*.

1047. *δουλία περ ἐν φρενί* (Schutz) is one of those emendations which are seen at once to be true, however we might have otherwise acquiesced in Robortello's reading *παρόν*, adopted by Paley, who compares

CHO. But I will not be angry, for I pity her;  
Come now, poor sufferer—leave that car alone,  
Yield to thy fate, and try on this new yoke.

CASSANDRA.

O woe, woe, woe, Gods and Earth!  
Apollo! Apollo!

CHO. Why hast thou cried woe! woe! for Loxias?  
He's not the God to have a mourner with him.

CASS. O woe, woe, woe, Gods and Earth!  
Apollo! Apollo!

CHO. There 'tis again! her ill tongue calls the God  
Who has no business to stand by in wailing.

CASS. Apollo! Apollo!  
Aguieus! Apollo of mine!

Thou hast destroyed me quite this second time.

CHO. She seems as if she'd tell of her own woes:  
Heaven still is there, albeit in her slave's mind.

CASS. Apollo! Apollo!  
Aguieus! Apollo of mine!

Ha! whither hast thou led me? to what roof?

CHO. To the Atridæ's: if thou know'st not that,  
I tell it thee: thou wilt not find it false.

CASS. Ah! ah!

Say rather a godless one, conscious of yore

Eurip. Orest. 1180, or even in Klausen's explanation of the MSS. *παρ' ἐν*.

1054. Lachmann, whom Klausen and the two last English editors follow, rightly makes *πολλὰ συνίστορα* κ. τ. λ. nominatives in parenthesis. The other construction, making *συνίστορα* a verbal governing an accusative, requires the alteration of *ἀπράναι*, though Peile has gone too far in objecting that *συνίστορα* could not well mean *conscious of*, as it obviously only comes to

mean *a witness*, because a witness is *ἴστωρ σὺν τῷ δεδρακότι*. The parenthesis probably closes after *κάρταναι*, so as to leave *ἀνδρὸς σφαγείον* κ. τ. λ. in apposition with *μισόθρον* (*στέγην*). In this connection there is no occasion to read *ἀνδροσφαγείον* with Paley after Symmons and Dobree, as if the compound can mean "a place for killing men," the simple word may surely mean "a place for killing." If this be inadmissible, it will be better to understand it in its ordinary sense of a *sacrificial vessel*,

αὐτοφόνα κακά τε κάρτάναι,  
 ἀνδρὸς σφαγείον, καὶ πέδον ῥαντήριον.

1055

ΧΟ. ἔοικεν εὖρις ἢ ξένη, κυνὸς δίκην,  
 εἶναι, ματεύειν δ' ὧν ἀνευρήσει φόνον.

ΚΑ. ᾠ̃ ᾠ̃.

ἀντ. γ'.

μαρτυρίοισι γὰρ τοῖσδ' ἐπιπείθομαι,  
 κλαιόμενα τάδε βρέφη σφαγὰς,  
 ὅπτάς τε σάρκας πρὸς πατρὸς βεβρωμένας.

1060

ΧΟ. ἧ μὲν κλέος σοῦ μαντικὸν πεπυσμένοι  
 ἦμεν· προφήτας δ' οὔτινας μαστεύομεν.

ΚΑ. ἰὼ πόποι, τί ποτε μήδεται;

στρ. δ'.

τί τόδε νέον ἄχος μέγα

1066

μέγ' ἐν δόμοισι τοῖσδε μήδεται κακὸν

ἄφερτον φίλοισι,

δυσίατον; ἀλκὰ δ' ἐκὰς ἀποστατεῖ.

ΧΟ. τούτων αἰδρίς εἰμι τῶν μαντευμάτων.

1070

removing the parenthesis and making the murders, the ropes, the σφαγείον, and the floor so many objects successively presented to Cassandra's imagination, than to introduce any change, as the present reading is strongly confirmed by a similar use of ἀνδρὸς in v. 1432, ἀνδρὸς οἰζὺς, the bane of a man or husband, and in Choeph. 534, ἀνδρὸς ὄψανον. κακά τε κάρτ. (Peile, after Pauw and Hermann) seems better than κακά κάκ' ἀρτ. (Dindorf) or κακά καὶ ἀρτ. (Paley), though the last may very well have been changed by copyists who wished to avoid the concourse of the diphthong and vowel. Paley objects to the meaning commonly given to ῥαντήριον, "sprinkled," as contrary to analogy, and prefers making it equivalent to ἀπορραντήριον, "locus uti servabatur aqua ad conspergendam victimam vel ad lustrationem adhibita;" but the whole floor of the house would not be an ἀπορραντήριον, which would more na-

turally consist of a vessel or trough:—and the passive use of σωτήριος in Soph. Œd. C. 487, adduced by Peile, justifies a similar acceptation here, though the floor might be called ῥαντήριον actively, as sprinkling with blood those who trod on it.

1058. In this verse the authority for ματεύει (for which the MSS. generally give μαντεύει) is superior to that for ματεύειν, while it is vain to argue, as Paley does, for ἀν εὐρήση as the old reading, as ANEYPHΣEI would equally represent both in an ancient text, and εὐρήσει is actually the reading of the Med. MS. (ap. Blomf.)

1061. τάδε is constructed like τάδε μὲν Περσῶν in Persæ 1.

1064. προφήτας δ' οὔτινας μαστεύομεν. τοὺς λέγοντας ἡμῖν περὶ σοῦ. Schol.: followed by Blomfield; but this would yield a very barren sense; nor is Peile's interpretation, that no prophets are needed in a matter of fact like the slaughter of Thyestes' children, much better, as the whole

Of many a fearful tale of sin,  
Death-ropes, and kin destroyed by kin—

A human slaughterhouse, with dripping floor.

CHO. The stranger seems to be sharp-scented, like  
A hound, and seeks for those whose blood she'll find.

CASS. Ah! ah!

Why, here is the witness whose tale I allow,  
These children with their throats cut fresh,  
Crying for their own roasted flesh,

On which their father, see! has supped but now.

CHO. Most true, we have heard of thy prophetic fame;  
But as for prophets, we require them not.

CASS. O all ye gods! what will she put to proof?  
What is this evil she intends,  
A fresh one, great too, great, beneath this roof,  
A horror to her friends

And hard to cure? but Help stands far aloof.

CHO. These bodings now I have no knowledge of:

context shows that the mention of the part does not strike the Chorus as inconsistent with Cassandra's reputation for prophetic power, though the mixture of past and future perplexes and horrifies them. Stanley's "de futura cæde" is too definite, as they do not see that any murder is to be perpetrated, in spite of their unconscious foreshadowings of the event in their last song. Klausen has given the meaning which before referring to the several commentators I had always supposed to be the natural and only one—"We are not anxious for prophets," a sentiment for which he aptly refers to vv. 1097, 241.

1066. *ἄχος*, the obvious correction of the common unmetrical reading *ἄχθος*, is found in the Florentine and Farnese MSS. Bothe and Butler prefer *ἄγος*; but that would rather

have been corrupted into *ἄλγος*, as in Choeph. 155. As to the construction, Blomfield supposes *ἄχος* to be the nom.—which is needless, and contradicted by the parallel passage, v. 1218. Paley puts the note of interrogation after *μέγα*, making the remainder a categorical statement. The rest, such as Klausen and Peile, print as Blomfield has done, though referring *μήδεαι* to Clytæmnestra. In that case it will be better to place a comma before *κακόν*, which will thus be removed from the chance of confusion with *ἄχος* and its epithets, and go with *ἄφετρον*.—I cordially agree with Peile, that it is much better to understand *ἀλλὰ* in a general sense, than with the Scholiast and Paley to refer it to Orestes, or with Klausen, to Menelaus.

ἐκείνα δ' ἔγνω· πᾶσα γὰρ πόλις βοᾷ.

ΚΑ. ἰὼ τάλαινα, τόδε γὰρ τελεῖς ; ἀντ. δ'.

τὸν ὁμοδέμνιον πόσιν

λούτροισι φαιδρύνασα—πῶς φράσω τέλος ;

τάχος γὰρ τόδ' ἔσται.

1075

προτείνει δὲ χεῖρ' ἐκ χερὸς ὀρεγομένα.

ΧΟ. οὔπω ξυνῆκα· νῦν γὰρ ἐξ αἰνιγμάτων

ἐπαργέμοισι θεσπάτοισ ἀμηχανῶ.

ΚΑ. ἔ, ἔ, παπαῖ παπαῖ, τί τόδε φαίνεται ; στρ. ε'.

ἦ δίκτυόν τί γ' Ἴδου ;

1080

ἀλλ' ἄρκυς ἢ ξύνευνος, ἢ ξυναιτία

φόνου. στάσις δ' ἀκόρετος γένει

κατολολυξάτω θύματος λευσίμου.

ΧΟ. ποίαν Ἐρινὺν τήνδε δώμασιν κέλει στρ. στ'.

ἐπορθιάζειν ; οὔ με φαιδρύνει λόγος.

1085

ἐπὶ δὲ καρδίαν ἔδραμε κροκοβαφῆς

σταγῶν, ἅτε καιρία πτώσιμος

ξυνανύτει βίου δύντος αὐγαῖς.

ταχεῖα δ' ἅτα πέλει.

1076. The occurrence of ὀρέγματα in a similar passage, Choeph. 426, is no reason for introducing it here, as ὀρεγομένα makes equally good sense, and an equally good parallel. ὀρεγμένα, the reading of the Flor. and Farn. MSS. is, as Peile has seen, merely an attempt at metrical correction.

1077. ἐξ αἰνιγμάτων is constructed like ἐξ ἀπιστίας in v. 257, where see the note. In Choeph. 887. ξυνῆκα τοῦπος ἐξ αἰνιγμάτων, the words contain rather the notion of *unravelling*, ἐκτολοπεύειν, just as *out of* in English might express either the *cause* or the *issue* of a thing.

1083. θύματος λευσίμου must be 'sacrificium lapidatione dignum,' as Heath and Blomfield translate it,

not 'lapidatione factum,' which would make the sacrifice to be that of Clytæmnestra, a notion foreign to the fact, and consequently by the prophetic mind of Cassandra, unless the words be supposed to be used either vaguely, without reference to any precise object, or as a denunciation, calling the Furies to exult over the death Clytæmnestra deserves; to meet which I have retained in my version "sacrificial stoning." That stoning was the *natural* punishment appears from v. 1587, where λεύσιμος occurs actively.

1086. κροκοβαφῆς σταγῶν is a bold expression, founded, as Stanley remarks, on the common opinion, that in excessive fear the blood runs back

The last I knew: the whole town rings with them.

CASS. O wretch! what is it this thou art about?

Giving thy wedded lord the cheer  
Of bathing? How shall I the end tell out?  
For it will soon be here.

See! see! hand after hand she's stretching out.

CHO. I understand not yet: her riddling strain  
Perplexes me with these dim oracles.

CASS. Ha! ha! O horror! what does this look like?

Some net of Hades' owning?  
That snare is his own wife: she helps to strike  
The blow—now let the 'vengeful Chorus shriek  
In horror o'er the sacrificial stoning!

CHO. What fury art thou bidding raise a scream  
Within? such words my soul can never cheer.  
Back to the heart the saffron shower  
Is running, which in man's last hour  
Keeps pace with life's departing beam—  
But Ate 'll soon be here.

to the heart.—Paleness thus over-  
spreads the countenance; and hence  
it is an easy transition to imagine  
the colour of the blood itself to be

changed to yellow. [Symmons makes  
an apposite reference to Massinger,  
Emperor of the East IV. 4.

My blood within me turns, and through my veins  
Parting with natural redness, I discern it  
Changed to a fatal yellow.

Singularly inappropriate on the con-  
trary is Blomfield's quotation from  
Shakspeare, "dear as the ruddy  
drops that visit my sad heart."

1087. *καῖρία* has been felicitously  
evolved by Dindorf out of the wreck  
of the readings of MSS. and old  
editions, *καὶ δωρία*, *καὶ διρία*, *καὶ δορία*.  
Preceding editors have generally  
acquiesced in Casaubon's *καὶ δορί*,  
which necessitated a change also in  
*πτώσιμος*. With regard to the sense,  
Paley makes *καρδίαν* the antecedent  
to *ἄτε καῖρία πτώσιμος*, which is  
strained to the last degree. Peile's  
*mortal*, *critical*, is doubtless the

meaning of *καῖρία*, though I have  
heard it suggested, very ingeniously,  
to construe it "momentarily,"—the  
blood trickling down drop by drop.  
*πτώσιμος* can be nothing else but  
this trickling; both Klausen's *cir-  
cumfusum* and Peile's *failing* or *sink-  
ing* are unnecessary deviations from  
the plain sense. The Chorus does  
not mean to say that it is sinking in  
death, but that the same drop which  
falls in death is trickling to its heart:  
nor do the words *necessarily* imply  
similar sensations, though that is  
probably intended.

- ΚΑ. ἂ ἄ· ἰδὸν ἰδού· ἄπεχε τῆς βοὸς ἄντ. έ. 1091  
τὸν ταῦρον· ἐν πέπλοισιν  
μελαγκέρων λαβοῦσα μηχανήματι  
τύπτει· πίτνει δ' ἐν ἐνύδρῳ τεύχει.  
δολοφόνου λέβητος τύχαν σοὶ λέγω.
- ΧΟ. οὐ κομπάσαιμ' ἂν θεσφάτων γνώμων ἄκρος ἄντ. στ'. 1096  
εἶναι· κακῶ δέ τῳ προσεικάζω τάδε.  
ἀπὸ δὲ θεσφάτων τίς ἀγαθὰ φάτις  
βροτοῖς στέλλεται; κακῶν γὰρ δίαί  
πολυεπεῖς τέχναι θεσπιφδὸν  
φόβον φέρουσιν μαθεῖν. 1100
- ΚΑ. ἰὼ, ἰὼ ταλαίνας κακόποτμοι τύχαι· στρ. ζ.  
τὸ γὰρ ἐμὸν θροῶ πάθος †ἐπεγχεάσα.  
ποῖ δὴ με δεῦρο τὴν τάλαιναν ἤγαγες;  
οὐδέν ποτ' εἰ μὴ ξυνθανουμένην. τί γάρ;
- ΧΟ. φρενομανῆς τις εἰ θεοφόρητος, ἄμ- στρ. η'. 1106  
φὶ δ' αὐτὰς θροεῖς  
νόμον ἄνομον, οἷά τις ξουθὰ

1092. μελαγκέρῳ μηχανήματι, the reading which Klausen extracts from the Scholiast does not improve the passage, as "a black-horned instrument" is a strange expression for a black horn used as an instrument might be used. It might possibly mean an instrument with a handle of black horn, referring to the axe, but the epithet then would not be much to the purpose, and the sense of μηχανήματι is fixed by the passage Peile quotes, Choeph. 980, as in apposition with πέπλοισι, in spite of the temptation to render it, as Potter does, by Milton's "two-handed engine."

1099. Why Hermann, Dindorf, and Paley should have changed θεσπιφδὸν into θεσπιφδοὶ is not very easy to see. There is surely nothing extraordinary in a hypallage, especially when its effect is to take an

epithet from a word which has one already and give it to one which has none.

1102. I have translated according to the ordinary reading ἐπεγχεάσα, though I am by no means so convinced of its genuineness as Butler and Peile seem to be. It is the inflicter, not the sufferer of sorrow, that is said to pour it into the cup; and so it is in the passages Peile refers to, vv. 1228, 1364. Seidler's ἐπ' ἄχεα σὰ is extremely ingenious, and possibly true, as the use of the accusative would be no bar to its reception, so long as the distinction between ἐπὶ with accus. upon in the sense of *motion*, and ἐπὶ with dat. upon in the sense of *rest*, is not lost sight of. Kennedy proposes ἐπ' ἔγχεσι, in my captivity, comparing such words as δοριάλωτος. It would be easy to multiply con-

CASS. Ha! ha! look, look! keep from the heifer there  
The bull! In that long clothing  
She catches his black horns as in a snare  
And strikes him! In the bath he falls! beware!  
I talk of the foul caldron's deed of loathing.

CHO. I would not plume myself on special skill  
In oracles: yet here I guess some harm.  
And sure, from those presaging seers,  
What good e'er came to mortal ears?  
Those wordy arts—they bring from ill  
Their tidings of alarm.

CASS. O woe for the grief of a wretched one's lot!  
For I mourn my own pain, having poured it on his.  
Where hast thou led me in my miseries?  
To die with him—nought else. And wherefore not?

CHO. Soul maddened art thou and heaven stirred,  
And for thyself dost wail  
In tuneless tune, like the tawny bird

jectures like ἐπ' ἔχθεσι, ἐπ' ἄχθεσι, ἐπ' ἄλγεσι, ἐπαχέουσα, as the reading of the antistrophe is equally fluctuating: but none of these carry conviction with them. In the next verse Paley's punctuation seems an improvement on the old one, which made the question end at ἤγαγες.

1107. ξουθός, like other words before pointed out, e. g. on v. 559, needs further examination than it has yet received. At first sight we are met by two different meanings assigned to it by ancient authorities, one referring to *colour*, the other to *sound* or *motion*. There can scarcely be a doubt that Paley is wrong in confining it entirely to the latter, as Athenæus (see Liddell and Scott) expressly speaks of it as a colour between ξανθός and πυρρός. All the instances too which have been quoted of its use will bear the sense of tawny, or something akin to it. The lines of Chæremon, Κόμαι δὲ κη-

ροχρῶτες, ὡς ἀγάλματος, Ξουθοῖσιν ἀνέμοις ἐνετρύφων φορούμενοι, are explained by Symmons, very probably, and quite in keeping with what he elsewhere calls "the soft and voluptuous colouring of Chæremon," as though the poet, "talking of the beauty and yellowness of those waxen tresses that dallied in the wind," had said "in effect, that they communicated their auburn hue to the winds that played amongst them." He is less fortunate in his interpretation of the passage from the Anthology (IV. fol. 200) about the cicada, οὔρεσι καὶ σκιερᾷς ξουθὰ λαλεῦντα νάπαις, "chirping the chirp of the yellow insect," unless he means ξουθὰ not to be governed by λαλεῦντα, but to stand in apposition with it. The application of words signifying colour to sound is not altogether without example: the very word by which ξουθός is frequently translated, *fuscus*, is some-



ἀκόρετος βοᾶς, φεῦ, ταλαιναῖς φρεσὶν  
 Ἰτυν Ἰτυν στένουσ' ἀμφιθαλῇ κακοῖς  
 ἀηδὼν βίον.

1110

ΚΑ. ἰὼ, ἰὼ λιγείας μόρον ἀηδόνοσ· ἀντ. ζ'.

περιβάλλοντο γὰρ οἱ πτεροφόρον δέμας  
 θεοὶ, γλυκύν τ' αἰῶνα κλαυμάτων ἄτερ·  
 ἐμοὶ δὲ μίμνει σχισμὸς ἀμφήκει δορί.

ΧΟ. πόθεν ἐπισσύτους θεοφόρους τ' ἔχεις ἀντ. η'.

ματαίους δύας,

1116

τὰ δ' ἐπίφοβα δυσφάτῳ κλαγγᾷ  
 μελοτυπεῖς, ὁμοῦ τ' ὀρθίοις ἐν νόμοις ;  
 πόθεν ὄρους ἔχεις θεσπεσίας ὁδοῦ  
 κακορρήμονας ;

1120

ΚΑ. ἰὼ γάμοι, γάμοι στρ. θ'.

Πάριδος, ὀλέθριοι φίλων.

ἰὼ Σκαμάνδρου πάτριον ποτόν·  
 τότε μὲν ἀμφὶ σὰς αἰόνας τάλαιν'  
 ἥνυτόμαν τροφαῖς·

1125

νῦν δ' ἀμφὶ Κωκυτόν τε κᾶχερουσίους  
 ὄχθους ἔοικα θεσπιωδήσειν τάχα.

ΧΟ. τί τόδε τορὸν ἄγαν ἔπος ἐφημίσω ; στρ. ι'.

νεογνὸς ἀνθρώπων μάθοι.

πέπληγμαι δ' ὑπαὶ δήγματι φοινίῳ,

1130

δυσάλγῃ τύχα μινυρὰ θρεομένας,

θραύματ' ἐμοὶ κλύειν.

ΚΑ. ἰὼ πόνοι, πόνοι ἀντ. θ'.

times applied to a voice, in the sense of *hollow*. Still words like ξέω, ξύω, ξόος, with which it is clearly connected, make for a sense implying vibration. Possibly, as in αἶολος, the notion of movement may be the primary one, and thence, as the ancients seem to have been sensible of the connection of colour with the motion of light, the sense

of tawny hue may have been derived. ξανθός is another word palpably in the same predicament, standing in a similar relation to ξαίνω. But more sifting is wanted than can be attempted here. Paley does not seem clear whether the sound of flying or of singing is the one intended.

1108. ταλαίνας for ταλαίνας is the

Moaning alas ! in ceaseless song  
Itys ! Itys ! all her sad life long,  
Unhappy nightingale.

CASS. O woe for the shrill-singing nightingale's fate !  
For the gods all about her a body have thrown  
With wings, and pleasant life without a groan :  
But me the sharp blade's cleaving must await.

CHO. Whence hast thou, rushing on heaven-borne,  
This anguish, all in vain,  
Sounding as from an ill-toned horn  
Grim fear, and eke an Orthian lay ?  
Whence come the limits of thy way,  
Terms of ill-boding strain ?

CASS. O wedding ! fatal wedding  
Of Paris, to his friends a death !  
O Xanthus, river of my father's drink !  
Once on thy grassy margin treading  
I passed my life's young spring ;  
But now beneath  
By Acheron and Cocytus' dismal brink  
Too soon must I my sad forebodings sing.

CHO. What word is this thou hast said too plain ?  
A babe might learn it, 'tis so clear.  
I am stabbed beneath with a deadly pain  
As thou wail'st thy fate in that sharp shrill strain,  
Heart-crushing sound to hear.

CASS. O battle ! cruel battle,

correction of Vettori.

1112. As all emendation must be uncertain in the present state of the strophe, I have allowed the old reading (though there is sufficient variation in the MSS. to create a question even on the point of antiquity) περιβάλλοντο γὰρ κ. τ. λ. to stand.

1119. To the instances given by the commentators of ὁδὸς or οἶμος used in a similar manner to θεσπεσίας ὁδοῦ here, add Eurip. Phœn.

911, ἀκούε δὴ νῦν θεσφάτων ἐμῶν ὁδόν.  
(I now see that it has been already adduced by Haupt.)

1128. Blomfield and Paley, by placing a note of interrogation after ἐφημίσω, avoid the questionable construction of τὶ in the oratio obliqua or subjoined clause, which should have been more amply defended and illustrated by those who have retained it.

πόλεος ὀλομένας τὸ πᾶν.

ἰὼ πρόπυργοι θυσῖαι πατρὸς  
πολυκανεῖς βοτῶν ποιονόμων. ἄκος δ'  
οὐδὲν ἐπήρκεσαν,  
τὸ μὴ πόλιν μὲν, ὥσπερ οὖν ἔχει, παθεῖν.  
ἐγὼ δὲ θερμόνους τάχ' ἐν πέδῳ βαλῶ.

1135

ΧΟ. ἐπόμενα προτέροισι τάδ' ἐφημίσω.  
καί τίς σε κακοφρονῶν τίθη-  
σι δαίμων ὑπερβαρὴς ἐμπίτνων,  
μελίζειν πάθῃ γοερά θανατοφόρα·  
τέρμα δ' ἀμηχανῶ.

ἀντ. ι'.

1141

ΚΑ. καὶ μὲν ὁ χρησμὸς οὐκέτ' ἐκ καλυμμάτων  
ἔσται δεδορκῶς, νεογάμου νύμφης δίκην·  
λαμπρὸς δ' ἔοικεν ἡλίου πρὸς ἀντολὰς  
πνέων ἐσθήξειν, ὥστε κύματος δίκην  
κλύζειν πρὸς αὐγὰς τοῦδε πῆματος πολὺ  
μεῖζον· φρενώσω δ' οὐκέτ' ἐξ αἰνιγμάτων.  
καὶ μαρτυρεῖτε συνδρόμῳ ἵχνος κακῶν  
ῤινηλατούσῃ τῶν πάλαι πεπραγμένων.  
τὴν γὰρ στέγην τήνδ' οὐποτ' ἐκλείπει χορὸς  
ξύμφθογγος, οὐκ εὐφωνος· οὐ γὰρ εὖ λέγει.  
καὶ μὲν πεπωκὼς γ', ὥς θρασύνεσθαι πλέον,  
βρότειον αἶμα, κῶμος ἐν δόμοις μένει,

1145

1150

1155

1139. The common reading must keep its ground against the several conjectures which have been proposed, as *θερμόνους* has all the marks of genuineness about it, while the only probable reading which would not require it to be altered, Blomfield's *τάδ'* for *τάχ'*, would produce but a lame conclusion to the sense in Cassandra's scattering of the garlands, as compared with that supplied by the mention of her actual death. Still, *βαλῶ* is very harsh, as even if *ἐμαντήν* were inserted, it would rather express a voluntary than a compul-

sory fall. Haupt's *θερμόν οὖν στάγμ'* is the most extraordinary suggestion, completely spoiling the metre. *θερμόνους* must doubtless be taken closely in connection with *βαλῶ*, so as to give the sense of Klausen's *θερμόν νοῦν*, just as in v. 101, if *φαίνουσ'* be correct, it may be joined with *ἀγανὰ*, as if put for *φαίνουσα τὴν ἀγανότητα*.

1149. *πρὸς αὐγὰς* has been well illustrated by the Oxford translator, who calls attention to the fact that at sunrise the waves seem to spring up as if to meet the light. "De

Waged round a city all o'erthrown !  
 O for my sire's protective sacrifice,  
 The slayer of the pastured cattle !  
 Yet all was nothing worth  
 To shield the town  
 From falling to that depth where now it lies :  
 But I shall soon press my hot breast to earth.

CHO. This strain is like that thou pour'dst of late :  
 And sure some baleful demon's spell  
 Falling on thee with a heavy weight  
 Has bound thee to chant of thy piteous fate :  
 But the end I cannot tell.

CASS. Aye, but the oracle no more shall peer  
 Out from his veil, as 'twere a new-wed bride :  
 No ; clear I see him rushing with a blast  
 To the sun's rising, so as, like a wave,  
 To dash a greater woe than this one up  
 To light : but I'll no longer teach by riddles.  
 And bear me witness, as concurrently  
 I scent the trace of evils done long since—  
 For this roof here a Chorus ne'er forsakes,  
 Harsh, though concordant : for they speak not well.  
 Aye, now that it has drunk, to inspire it more,  
 Man's blood, there lingers in the house a revel

hoc judicent," says Butler, "qui solis ortum inter navigandum viderint." It certainly gives additional force to the image, though the common sense of "dashing up to daylight," would have been sufficient against Auratus' correction *πρὸς ἀκτὰς* and Blomfield's *πρὸς αὐτὰς*. If *κλύζειν* be taken actively, *κύματος δίκην* must be referred not to the subject, but to the object of the verb.

1151. *ῥινηλατούση* may be taken either with *μαρτυρεῖτε*, in which case *συνδρόμως* will be keeping close on the track, and as it were running along with it ; or with *συνδρόμως*,

when the metaphor will be from one running side by side with a dog, and so being able to attest its success.

1156. Paley rightly observes that Donaldson (*Theatre of the Greeks*, p. 51) has thrown great light on this passage, referring it to the custom of drunken revellers, who used generally to "wander forth, flown with insolence and wine," but sometimes, as here, would not quit the tavern, though well drunk. Thus we see how every word tells ;—the company of Furies has drunk human blood for wine ; but this has not

δύσπεμπος ἔξω, ξυγγόνων Ἑρινύων.  
 ὕμνοῦσι δ' ὕμνον, δώμασιν προσήμεναι,  
 πρῶταρχον ἄτην· ἐν μέρει δ' ἀπέπτυσαν  
 εὐνὰς ἀδελφοῦ τῷ πατοῦντι δυσμενεῖς.  
 ἥμαρτον, ἢ θηρῷ τι τοξότης τις ὥς;  
 ἢ ψευδόμαντις εἰμι θυροκόπος φλέδων;  
 ἐκμαρτύρησον προὔμόσας τό μ' εἰδέναι  
 λόγῳ παλαιὰς τῶνδ' ἀμαρτίας δόμων.

1160

ΧΟ. καὶ πῶς ἂν ὄρκος πῆμα γενναίως παγὲν  
 παιώνιος γένοιτο; θαυμάζω δέ σου,  
 πόντου πέραν τραφεῖσαν, ἀλλόθρουν πόλιν  
 κυρεῖν λέγουσαν ὥσπερ εἰ παρεστάτεις.

1165

ΚΑ. μάντις μ' Ἀπόλλων τῷδ' ἐπέστησεν τέλει.

ΧΟ. μῶν καὶ θεός περ ἱμέρῳ πεπληγμένος;

1170

ΚΑ. προτοῦ μὲν αἰδῶς ἦν ἐμοὶ λέγειν τάδε.

had the effect of satisfying them, but rather that of making them more turbulent, and inclining them to resist the wishes of the owner of the house, who would fain get rid of them.

1158. "I agree with Klausen in referring πρῶταρχον ἄτην to the murder of Thyestes' children by Atreus, and not, as Blomfield and others after Schutz have done, to the murder of Myrtilus by Pelops . . . first, because Æschylus has not made express mention of Myrtilus, which both the later Tragedians have been careful to do, and secondly, because the words ἐν μέρει δ' ἀπέπτυσαν have much more the air of an explanation of the preceding context than of a continuation of it." Peile.

1160. "Difficile est dictu utrum δυσμενεῖς sit recti an accusativi casus. Lectus Atrei haud injuria hostilis, sc. exitialis, dici poterat Thyestæ, qui eum conculcaverat, sed et Furiae eadem de caussa Thyestæ infensæ dici possint. Nescio tamen an præstet cum εὐνὰς conjungere:

ita enim epitheta plerumque apud poetas poni solent." Butler. (curæ secundæ apud Peile.) If ἀπέπτυσαν κ. τ. λ. be the continuation of πρῶταρχος ἄτη, that being the murder of Thyestes' children, δυσμενεῖς must agree with εὐνὰς, as without such an epithet it would seem as though the pollution of the bed and not the terrible vengeance exacted for it were the object of the Furies' hatred.

1161. θηρῷ is Canter's correction for τηρῷ, which Klausen alone retains. τηρῷ might certainly be applied to an archer keeping his eye on an object; but this is not the proper opposite to ἥμαρτον, which requires θηρῷ, or a word similar in sense.

1165. Symmons is the only one of the recent writers on the Agamemnon who has questioned the necessity of reading with Auratus πῆγμα for πῆμα. He translates "How could an oath, the evil fixed so fast, Help it or cure?" making πῆγμα κ. τ. λ. the case absolute. I have preferred understanding it as governed by παιώνιον,

Hard of expulsion—of the sister Furies.  
 A song they sing, all sitting by the halls,  
 The primal curse; and each in turn they loathe  
 The brother's bed that spared not its defiler.  
 Missed I, or catch I ought as archer should?  
 Or am I as some lying streetdoor canter?  
 Bear witness with an oath that I know well  
 By tale the old transgressions of this house.

CHO. How could an oath so cure the evil fixed  
 From generations? but I wonder at thee  
 That, bred beyond the sea, thou hitt'st in talk  
 A foreign town, e'en as thou hadst been there.

CASS. The seer Apollo put me on this task.

CHO. What, though a god, o'ercome by fond desire?

CASS. 'Till now I was ashamed to speak of this.

and have rendered *γενναιῶς* "from generations," though it may undoubtedly mean *firmly* fixed—fixed, that is, so as not to disgrace its parentage, or, as we should say, genuinely, like ἡ γενναία τύραννος, Plato, Rep. VIII. 544 C. It has sometimes struck me that *πήγματα* should take the place of *πήματα* in Prom. 442. τῶν βροτοῖς δὲ πήματα, where Heath has proposed *εὐρήματα*, Burges *πλάσματα*, from a MS. reading *πταίσματα*. *πήγματα* would then be "the things which I fixed or established among mortals," though it must be confessed that such a use of the word would be rather harsh, and a careful consideration of vv. 442–6 will afford grounds for justifying the common reading. *παιώνιον* may be defended, as meaning "a healing thing;" but it is better to read *παιώνιος* with the Farnese MS., as it is easy to suppose that the neuter was introduced by those who did not understand the construction of *πῆμα*.

1169. Klausen in vain attempts to defend the old arrangement of

this and the following lines, according to which vv. 1169, 71 were followed by 1170, 2. Independently of the *στιχομυθία*, the sense of v. 1172, which he fruitlessly endeavours to explain as a reason suggested by the Chorus for Apollo falling in love with Cassandra, is decisive against him. He asks, "Cujusmodi est hæc doctrina, quæ virginalē pudorem judicet esse nimiam molliem?" but the Chorus simply means that in circumstances which call forth deep feeling conventionalities are disregarded, *ἀβρύνεται* being said only with reference to the occasion. Similar expressions might easily be accumulated: thus in Eurip. Phœn. 1276, Ἄντ. αἰδούμεθ' ὅχλον. Ἴο. οὐκ ἐν αἰσχύνῃ τὰ σά; and several times in Iph. Aul. v. 858. οὐχ ἀβρύνομαι τῷδ' ἡ τύχη γὰρ οὐκ ἐγώ. v. 901. τί γὰρ ἐγὼ σεμνύνομαι; v. 1343, 4. οὐκ ἐν ἀβρότητι κείσαι πρὸς τὰ νῦν πεπτωκότα. ἀλλὰ μίμν' οὐ σεμνότητος ἔργον, ἣν δυνώμεθα: (supposing the last line to be genuine).

ΧΟ. ἀβρύνεται γὰρ πᾶς τις εὖ πράσσω·ν πλέον.

ΚΑ. ἀλλ' ἦν παλαιστῆς, κάρτ' ἐμοὶ πνέων χάριν.

ΧΟ. ἦ καὶ τέκνων εἰς ἔργον ἤλθετον νόμῳ ;

ΚΑ. ξυναινέσασα Λοξίαν ἐψευσάμην.

1175

ΧΟ. ἤδη τέχναισιν ἐνθέοις ἤρημένη ;

ΚΑ. ἤδη πολίταις πάντ' ἐθέσπιζον πάθη.

ΧΟ. πῶς δῆτ' ἄνατος ἦσθα Λοξίου κότῳ ;

ΚΑ. ἔπειθον οὐδέν' οὐδέν, ὥς τάδ' ἤμπλακον.

ΧΟ. ἡμῖν γε μὲν δὴ πιστὰ θεσπίζειν δοκεῖς.

1180

ΚΑ. ἰοὺ ἰοὺ, ὦ ὦ κακά.

ὑπ' αὖ με δεινὸς ὀρθομαντείας πόνος  
στροβεῖ, ταρασσών φροιμίῳις †ἐφημίῳις.

ὁρᾶτε τούσδε τοὺς δόμοις ἐφημένους  
νέους, ὀνείρων προσφερέῃς μορφώμασιν ;

1185

παῖδες, θανόντες ὥσπερ εἰ πρὸς τῶν φίλων,  
χεῖρας κρεῶν πλήθοντες οἰκείας βορᾶς,

σὺν ἐντέροις τε σπλάγχν', ἐποίκτιστον γέμος,  
πρέπουσ' ἔχοντες, ὧν πατὴρ ἐγεύσατο.

ἐκ τῶνδε ποινὰς φημι βουλεύειν τινὰ

1190

λέοντ' ἀναλκιν ἐν λέχει στρωφώμενον

οἰκουρὸν, οἴμοι, τῷ μολόντι, δεσπότη

1174. I have not adopted Elmsley's ἡλθέτην, not being satisfied that he is right in introducing it. "Multa Tragicorum et Aristophanis loca correxit ad Eurip. Med. 1041," says Butler ; a number of instances which must surely have some weight in an induction. Even supposing that -την, -την was the Attic usage, we are not to look for a fully developed Atticism in Æschylus.

1178. ἄνατος for ἄνακτος here, and οὐδέν' for οὐδέν in the next line, are Canter's corrections. I have not thought it worth while in general to notice the fact of a correction having been made when it has long formed part of the received text, unless any

of the later editors has thought it worth while to dispute it. This Haupt does here, as in other places, making out untenable defences for the old reading, yet eventually saying, "recipiendam nihilominus putavi Canteri emendationem," and this without giving any reason for his decision.

1183. ἐφημίῳις is universally admitted to be corrupt, none but Klausen and Haupt even hinting that any sense could possibly be extracted from it. There is however no other reading to take its place, though Jacobs' ἐφυμνίῳις, adopted by Blomfield, is generally considered to have the best claim. All that can

CHO. Aye, for when prospering, folks are delicate.

CASS. He was a champion breathing favour o'er me!

CHO. And did ye come to wedlock and its work?

CASS. I first agreed to Loxias, then deceived him.

CHO. What, when already mistress of his art?

CASS. Already I foretold my townsmen's woes.

CHO. And how then didst thou 'scape from Loxias' wrath?

CASS. I gained no credence, since I had done this wrong.

CHO. Well, we at least see truth in what thou say'st.

CASS. O! O! misery!

Again the sharp pang of true prophesying  
Whirls me, and with its preludes makes me mad.  
Look, look! see ye those youths there in the house  
Sitting, in semblance like the forms of dreams?  
Aye, children, butchered as it were by friends,  
With hands full of the meat of their own flesh,  
Stand forth! their entrails too they carry with them,  
A piteous load—which their own father tasted!  
And 'tis for this I say there's plotting vengeance  
A dastard lion, wallowing in the bed,  
Waiting, ah me, for him that comes, that master

be made out is, that *-ιους* was the termination of the real word, that being the only part left after that which belongs to *ἐφημένους* in the next line, the obvious source of the confusion, has been rejected: and even that is not quite certain, as the Venetian and Farnese MSS. give *ἐφημένους* or *ἐφημένους* here, so that it is possible that the whole word may have been lost in the confusion.

1186. Paley joins *ὥσπερ* with *παῖδες*, but the order of the words seems rather against this. Klausen, taking it with *πρὸς τῶν φίλων*, and understanding it "as is natural that they should die by the hands of their friends," discovers a bitter irony in the passage: but I am inclined to think that it means no

more than "slain, it would seem," or "slain, to all appearance." She does not see the murder, but she has a consciousness of what has taken place.

1187. It is surely better to make *οἰκείας βορᾶς* with Butler in apposition to *κρεῶν*, than to suppose an accumulation of genitives with Peile. The case in v. 1209, to which the latter refers, is not parallel, as there both genitives belong to *δαῖτα*, separately, and in different senses, like *εὐνῆς παροψώνημα τῆς ἐμῆς χλιδῆς*, v. 1418.

1192. Paley has anticipated me in proposing *οἶμαι* for *οἶμοι*; and I fancy I have seen it suggested by some one elsewhere. If *οἶμοι* be correct, it is probably the piteousness of the whole matter that is meant.



ἐμῷ· φέρειν γὰρ χρὴ τὸ δούλιον ζυγόν.

νεῶν τ' ἄπαρχος Ἰλίου τ' ἀναστάτης

οὐκ οἶδεν, οἷα γλῶσσα μισητῆς κυνὸς

1195

λέξασα κακτείνασα φαιδρόνους, δίκην

Ἄτης λαθραίου, τεύξεται κακῇ τύχῃ.

τοιαῦτα τολμᾷ· θῆλυς ἄρσενος φονεὺς

ἐστίν. τί νιν καλοῦσα δυσφιλὲς δάκος

τύχοιμ' ἄν; ἀμφίσβαιναν, ἣ Σκύλλαν τινὰ

1200

οἰκοῦσαν ἐν πέτρασι, ναυτίλων βλάβην,

θύουσαν αἴδου μητέρ', ἄσπονδον τ' ἄρην

φίλοις πνέουσαν; ὥς δ' ἐπωλολύξατο

ἡ παντότολμος, ὥσπερ ἐν μάχης τροπῇ.

δοκεῖ δὲ χαίρειν νοστίμῳ σωτηρίᾳ.

1205

καὶ τῶνδ' ὅμοιον εἴ τι μὴ πείθω· τί γάρ;

τὸ μέλλον ἥξει. καὶ σύ μ' ἐν τάχει παρὼν

ἄγαν γ' ἀληθόμαντιν οἰκτείρας ἐρεῖς.

ΧΟ. τὴν μὲν Θυέστου δαῖτα παιδείων κρεῶν

ξυνῆκα καὶ πέφρικα· καὶ φόβος μ' ἔχει,

1210

κλύοντ' ἀληθῶς οὐδὲν ἐξεικασμένα.

τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἀκούσας, ἐκ δρόμου πεσὼν τρέχω.

ΚΑ. Ἀγαμέμνονός σέ φημ' ἐπόψεσθαι μόρον.

ΧΟ. εὖφημον, ὦ τάλαινα, κοίμησον στόμα.

Symmons, referring it to what follows, gives it with great force, as indeed he has given the whole of this wonderful scene:

Upon his lair the rolling lion turns,  
And keeps house close, until the coming of  
My master! Said I master? out! alas!  
I am a slave, and I must bear the yoke.

But in that case it would probably have had a different position.

1194. Klausen seems right in resisting Canter's substitution of ἔπαρχος for ἄπαρχος, referring to Choeph. 664. where the word is found in the best MSS.

1195. οἷα λέξασα οἷα τεύξεται. Peile, Paley: but there is no occasion to

take οἷα with λέξασα, which is brought in further to explain γλῶσσα. Bothe's λείξασα is ingenious, and avoids the necessity of adopting Canter's κακτείνασα; but the past κτείνασα will not agree with the future τεύξεται. The tongue itself is said to devise the mischief, as the hand in Sept. 554 ὁρᾷ τὸ δράσιμον, so that we need not

Of mine :—for I must bear a slave's hard yoke.  
 Ruler of vessels, overthrower of Troy,  
 He knows not what the tongue of a hateful bitch  
 That talked so long and smilingly, like Ate  
 In secret, will devise him to his hurt !  
 Such is her daring : Woman will be slayer  
 Of Man ! What hateful monster shall I call her  
 And hit it ? Amphisbæna ? or some Scylla  
 Dwelling in rocks, the bane of mariners ?  
 One of hell's Bacchante mothers, truceless war  
 Outbreathing to her friends ?—and how she shouted,  
 The all-daring one, as when the fight rolls back !  
 She would be thought to joy in his return !—  
 Well, 'tis all one if I persuade not—why ?  
 The Future 'll come : and thou, here standing, soon  
 Wilt sigh, and own my prophecy too true.

CHO. The Thyestean feast of children's flesh  
 I knew and shuddered at : and terror holds me  
 To hear the tale in truth, and nothing feigned.  
 But, though I heard the rest, I lose the track.

CASS. I say thou shalt see Agamemnon's end.

CHO. Peace, peace, forlorn one, lull thy tongue to rest !

supply *μυσητή κύων* with Klausen, Peile, and Dindorf.

1202. *θύουσιν μητέρα* is equivalent to *θυιάδα*. Thus the meaning is not that Clytæmnestra is the mother of Hell in the sense of producing death, any more than *δίκτυον Αἴδου* in v. 1080 means a net to catch death, but that she is an infernal Bacchanal—"Pro *ἀρὰν* probabiliter corrigunt *Ἄρην*, sed tamen vulgatum non offendit." Paley. *ἀσπονδὸν* however points strongly to *ἄρην*. If *ἀρὰν* be retained, it must be taken after *πνέουσιν*, in spite of Klausen's objection, "*nihil est πνεῖν ἀρὰν*," which is a more arbitrary assertion, amply disproved by such expressions as *πνεῖν φόβον*, *κότον* κ. τ. λ. The friends

against whom the Bacchanal breathes war or curses are the friends of Clytæmnestra, as she herself is the Bacchanal.

1208. *ἐπωλολύξατο* is to be compared with *χαμαιπετὲς βόαμα προσχάνης ἐμοὶ* in v. 889, not with *ἀνωλόλυξα* in v. 568, much less with Clytæmnestra's speech *after* the death of Agamemnon, as the next line shows. "As in the battle when the tide rolls back," is Symmons' version of *ὥσπερ ἐν μάχης τροπῇ* : and I have also hit unconsciously on the same line with him just below, "The Thyestean feast of children's flesh."

1214. *εὐφημον—στόμα*. See the end of the note on v. 118, &c.

ΚΑ. ἀλλ' οὔτι Παιὼν τῷδ' ἐπιστατεῖ λόγῳ.

1215

ΧΟ. οὐκ, εἴπερ ἔσται γ'· ἀλλὰ μὴ γένοιτό πως.

ΚΑ. σὺ μὲν κατεύχει, τοῖς δ' ἀποκτείνειν μέλει.

ΧΟ. τίνος πρὸς ἀνδρὸς τοῦτ' ἄχος πορσύνεται;

ΚΑ. ἧ κάρτ' ἀρ' ἂν παρεσκόπεις χρησμῶν ἐμῶν.

ΧΟ. τοῦ γὰρ τελοῦντος οὐ ξυνῆκα μηχανήν.

1220

ΚΑ. καὶ μὲν ἄγαν γ' Ἑλλην' ἐπίσταμαι φάτιν.

ΧΟ. καὶ γὰρ τὰ πυθόκραντα, δυσμαθῇ δ' ὅμως.

1215. "But Pæon (Apollo as god of healing) does not preside over this that I am speaking of, so that it will not come the less for my ceasing to speak of it."

1216. εἴπερ ἔσται is certainly more probable in itself than εἰ παρέσται, and the authority of MSS. in a case like this is very slight. Wellauer in vain argues that εἰ παρέσται λόγος means "if what thou sayest shall come to pass," so that ἔσται would be superfluous, not to say contrary to the sense. The use of γένοιτο shows that εἶναι is the natural expression to apply to λόγος, which, as explained above, is equivalent to τὸ λεγόμενον.

1218. Peile argues against ἄγος, Auratus' conjecture adopted by Blomfield and others, that it is used for a *pollution or curse*, not for a *polluted or cursed thing*, as if any distinct authority were wanted for one sense passing into the other in the case of this particular word, after the many instances of the kind in the language, or as if ἄγος might not be taken here in what he calls its true sense, a *pollution or polluting thing*. It would have been better to have said no more than that ἄγος is perfectly unnecessary (compare v. 1066, where ἄχος must be the true reading, as shown in the note), which would have been a sufficient, and at the same time unassailable defence of the text as it stands.

1219. This line has been frequently attempted, partly on metrical, still more on philological grounds. Haupt alone defends it in its present state, though somewhat hesitatingly, as he proposes to read it interrogatively, and admits that in the passages he quotes from Eurip. Suppl. 305, Hipp. 700 it is in the apodosis that καρτ' ἂν occurs with the imperfect. It is strange that he should not have argued more boldly, and shown that it is here used in precisely the same manner, as a conditional sentence is necessarily tantamount to an apodosis, always referring to a protasis understood, if not expressed. Here our protasis will be εἰ τοῦτο ἐφρόνεις, or something similar, "if you meant to ask what *man* is to *do* the deed, you must indeed," &c. It is strange too that Peile, who translates "Truly you were, i. e. (Anglice) you must have been," should not have allowed his sense of the requirements of English usage to guide him right, as he has done in many instances in spite of the arbitrary restrictions set up by grammarians. The rule commonly given is that ἂν with the past indicative is used in the apodosis when a person is speaking of some event which would have occurred had something else happened which did not happen. Nor need it be violated here, as it may be said that Cassandra is speak-

CASS. But there's no Pæon now for this I say.

CHO. Not, if it be: but may it ne'er be done!

CASS. Thou prayest against it: but they think of killing.

CHO. Then by what man is this sad deed devised?

CASS. Thou must indeed have read my sayings wrong.

CHO. Aye, for the means of one to do it I see not.

CASS. And yet I know the tongue of Greece too well.

CHO. Yes, and the Pythian fates: but still they're hard.

ing of an event just past, viz. the impression which prevailed in the mind of the Chorus at the time they asked their question, and, to show more clearly her wonder at their dulness of comprehension, affects to consider the mistake as a thing which would have happened if it had been possible that they could really have meant such a question. But the propriety of the rule itself as it stands may well be doubted. There are abundant instances of the use of the imperfect with *ἄν* simply in reference to a thing past, without implying that the thing did not happen. Such are expressions of the class of *εἰ τοι εἶχεν, ἐδίδου ἄν*, which are generally considered as entirely distinct, and accounted for by a rule about the imperfect with *ἄν*, denoting custom: a statement certainly true, but no more involving the necessity of a new rule than the similar use of the English *would* requires to be distinguished from the ordinary potential. *ἄν παρυσκόπεις* will then mark merely the event just past, namely, the speech of the Chorus: "thou must indeed have read my sayings wrong," as the translation gives it. With regard to the metre, it is now generally allowed that most of the instances of offence against the pause in the trimeter collected in Porson's preface to the *Hecuba* are more to be regarded as exceptions to a general

rule than to be forced into conformity with it.

1222. Most of the editors supply *ἐπίστανται* after *τὰ πυθόκρanta*, making the sense to be, "Thy words are in Greek, it is true; but so are the Pythian oracles, and still they are difficult." Symmons, arguing against Markland's alteration of *ἐπίσταμαι* in the verse before into *ἐπίστασαι*, maintains that *ἐπίστασαι* must here be understood, and explains the whole connection as follows: "To the Chorus, who says, 'I don't understand you,' Cassandra replies, 'Yet I speak your own language to you, I know it *too well*!' (This *too well* contains a fine, plaintive, melancholy reflection in her mouth.) To which the Chorus naturally replies, 'Yes, yes, no question as to *your* knowledge, for you know even the oracles; but to *me* they are difficult to comprehend.'" There can be little doubt that the grammatical part of the latter interpretation is right, as the personification of the *πυθόκρanta* is not very suitable to the context: still, the point of the matter does not seem to lie in Cassandra's knowledge, as such. Her words only mean, "I speak a language which you understand," and the Chorus cannot be supposed to take them as anything further, so that the sense of the next line must turn mainly on the point of understanding in the hearer. We may

ΚΑ. παπαῖ· οἶον τὸ πῦρ· ἐπέρχεται δέ μοι.  
 ὅτοτοί, Λύκει' Ἀπολλον· οἱ ἐγὼ, ἐγώ.  
 αὕτη δίπους λέαινα, συγκοιμωμένη 1225  
 λύκῳ, λέοντος εὐγενοῦς ἀπουσία,  
 κτενεῖ με τὴν τάλαιναν· ὥς δὲ φάρμακον  
 τεύχουσα, κάμου μισθὸν ἐνθήσει κότῳ.  
 ἐπεύχεται, θήγουσα φωτὶ φάσγανον,  
 ἐμῆς ἀγωγῆς ἀντιτίσασθαι φόνον. 1230  
 τί δῆτ' ἐμαυτῆς καταγέλῳτ' ἔχω τάδε,  
 καὶ σκῆπτρα, καὶ μαντεῖα περὶ δέρη στέφη;  
 σὲ μὲν πρὸ μοίρας τῆς ἐμῆς διαφθερῶ.  
 ἴτ' ἐς φθόρον πεσόντα γ'· ὧδ' ἀμείψομαι.  
 ἄλλην τιν' ἄτης ἀντ' ἐμοῦ πλουτίζετε. 1235  
 ἰδοὺ δ' Ἀπόλλων αὐτὸς ἐκδύων ἐμὲ  
 χρηστηρίαν ἐσθῆτ', ἐποπτεύσας δέ με  
 κὰν τοῖσδε κόσμοις καταγελωμένην μέγα

suppose then the full meaning to be, “Yes, we may be able to understand thy language, yet utterly blind to thy intent: thou art skilled in the Pythian oracles, which are in our own tongue, yet for all that we find them hard.”

1225. *δίπους λέαινα* is like *λέοντα ἀγάλακτον*, v. 695, where see the note.

1228. A number of ingenious conjectures have been hazarded on this verse, all of them however unnecessary, and as such properly rejected by the later writers. Scaliger gives *πιστὸν—κύτει* for *μισθὸν—κότῳ*. The margin of Voss's copy has *μικτὸν—ποτῷ*, which last word is due to Casaubon, and adopted by Dindorf. It is however inferior to the common reading, as it would have the effect of defining the image of the poisoner, which is merely suggested by the common metaphor *ἐνθήσει*, too strongly, and thus clash-

ing with the lines immediately following, where we see Clytæmnestra preparing another kind of death.

1233. Jacobs' reading, *ἴτ' ἐς φθόρον πεσόντα γ'· ὧδ' ἀμείψομαι*, is certainly the best. *ἐγὼ δ' ἄμ' ἔψομαι*, a conjecture adopted by Scholefield and Dindorf, is very plausible at first sight, but on a full view of the context, it may be doubted whether it does not interrupt the chain of thought.—Paley's *ἄγ' ὧδ' ἄμ' ἔψομαι*, has this fault, that of precipitating the mention of her own death, in a still greater degree, beside the additional ones of producing a line made up of jerks more in the fashion of the modern than of the ancient drama, and involving the sense of the poet in a dilemma by the introduction of *ἄγε*. To whom is the imperative addressed? If to the garlands, we get the not very probable image of Cassandra's prophetic ornaments acting as the officer

CASS. O me! how fierce the fire is! it comes on me!  
 O! O! Lycean Apollo! ah me! ah me!  
 She here, the two-legged lioness, lying with  
 The wolf in the absence of the generous lion,  
 Will kill me, wretch! and like one mixing poison  
 Will add the price of me too to her wrath.  
 Yes, as she sharpens for her lord the steel,  
 She boasts she'll pay back death for bringing me!  
 Why keep I still these mockeries of myself,  
 Sceptres, and prophet-garlands round my neck?  
 Off! I'll destroy you ere I die myself—  
 Go! fall and perish! thus will I requite you—  
 Endow another one with woes, not me.  
 And see! Apollo stripping me himself  
 Of my prophetic robes—yes, he that marked me  
 E'en in these trappings laughed aloud to scorn

who is to lead her to death: if to some party not hitherto named, the confusion of imperatives is equally objectionable. Without stopping to inquire whether he is right in condemning as ridiculous Klausen's note, "bene additur particula, quia in cadendo positum coronarum exitium," we may say that γε at any rate calls attention to πεισόντα, and shows that as much stress is to be laid on the falling of the garlands as if it had been written πίπτετε καὶ ἴτε κ. τ. λ.

1235. Peile justly argues that ἄτης is required by the context, as specifying the sense of πλουτίζετε. Naeke and Klausen, in their attempts to vindicate ἄτην as applied by Cassandra to herself, have not seen that her *present* feeling at any rate is not one of self-denunciation. ἄλλην, which Paley adopts from Askew's marginal readings, as being "simplicissimum et vi poetica in primis commendatum," has been justly rejected by the other editors, as really

weakening the sentence which it appears to strengthen: and Linwood's εἴ τι' is not more forcible.

1237. ἐποπτεύσας. "Apollinem conspicere sibi videtur privantem se ea veste, quam non nisi eo concepit ut ludibrio propter eam vexaretur, neque antequam perfecta sunt omnia hæc ludibria, sibi exuit." Klausen. The precise force of the word in this connection appears to be, "See! Apollo himself is stripping me—he too being the one that marked me," δὲ stating an additional fact committed by the same person at a different time, and so charging Apollo with both insults.

1238. Hermann's μέγα is not quite satisfactory, but at any rate it yields a better sense than can be extracted from μετά. Paley renders "inter ipsos amicos, sc. Trojæ, frustra rideri ab inimicis," apparently making ἐχθρῶν "those who disliked me in Troy," which is not very natural. It matters little whether we suppose an asyndeton φίλων

φίλων ὑπ', ἐχθρῶν, οὐ διχορρόπως, μάτην.  
 καλουμένη δὲ φοιτὰς, ὡς ἀγύρτρια, 1240  
 πτωχὸς, τάλαινα, λιμόθνης ἡνεσχόμην.  
 καὶ νῦν ὁ μάντις, μάντιν ἐκπράξας ἐμέ,  
 ἀπήγαγ' ἐς τοιάσδε θανασίμους τύχας.  
 βωμοῦ πατρώου δ' ἄντ' ἐπίξηνον μένει,  
 θερμῷ κοπείσης φοινίῳ προσφάγματι. 1245  
 οὐ μὲν ἄτιμοί γ' ἐκ θεῶν τεθνήξομεν.  
 ἥξει γὰρ ἡμῶν ἄλλος αὖ τιμάορος,  
 μητροκτόνον φίτυμα, ποινάτωρ πατρός·  
 φυγὰς δ' ἀλήτης, τῆσδε γῆς ἀπόξενος,  
 κάτεισιν, ἄτας τάσδε θριγκώσων φίλοις· 1250  
 ὁμώμοται γὰρ ὄρκος ἐκ θεῶν μέγας,  
 ἄξειν νιν ὑπτίασμα κειμένου πατρός.  
 τί δῆτ' ἐγὼ κάτοικος ὧδ' ἀναστένω;  
 ἐπεὶ τὸ πρῶτον εἶδον Ἰλίου πόλιν  
 πράξασαν ὡς ἔπραξεν, οἱ δ' εἶχον πόλιν, 1255

(καὶ) ἐχθρῶν, with Peile, or with Wellauer take ἐχθρῶν οὐ διχορρόπως in apposition with φίλων.

1240. "Non intelligo Casandram revera mendicam, miseram, famelicam fuisse: neque enim id ex hoc loco colligi potest, neque si in eo fuisset statu tanquam ἐξαιρέτον δωρημα (v. 923) Agamemnoni delata fuisset: sed tantum eam insam dictam fuisse ac ludibrio habitam, perinde ac si misera quædam circulatrix fuisset, quae stipem rogat." Butler (ap. Peile). With φοιτὰς compare Eurip. Troad. 42. μεθῆκ' Ἀπόλλων δρομάδα Κασάνδραν ἀναξ.

1242. Peile and Paley agree to translate "having made an end of me as a prophetess:" but how could Apollo be said to have done this? surely not by the destruction of her symbols of office? By the undoing is obviously meant the course of treatment to which Apollo had sub-

jected her, now consummated by her death: and μάντιν is brought in on account of μάντις immediately preceding. The thought, if developed as a modern poet would be likely to develop it, would turn upon the heightening of the indignity by the fact that it was a prophet who so treated a prophet, and perhaps also on the disparity between a god and a mortal, as it was the same office which glorified the one and undid the other.

1244. I am by no means sure that ἀντεπίξηνον in one word, the old reading, is indefensible, the sense being the same as that of the correction ἄντ' ἐπίξηνον. ἀντίμολπον ἄκος ὑπνου in v. 17 goes far to justify ἀντεπίξηνον βωμοῦ here, showing that ἀντὶ in composition may affect not the word with which it is compounded, but some other, as if it were out of composition. Still, as



By friends, by foes too plainly—all in vain !  
 They called me vagrant, like a fortune-teller,  
 A poor starved beggar—yet I bore it all.  
 And now the seer, undoing me, a seer,  
 Hath led me to such deadly fate as this.  
 Lo ! for my father's altar stands a block  
 For me, when pierced with the hot bloody gash.  
 Well—we'll not die unhonored of the gods—  
 No—there shall come for us another champion,  
 A matricidal birth, his sire's avenger :  
 This wandering exile, stranger to the land,  
 Shall come, to crown this ruin for his friends :  
 For a great oath has by the gods been sworn,  
 That his fallen father's corpse shall bring him back.  
 Why then bewail I thus before the house ?  
 Now that I have seen first Ilion's city faring  
 As it hath fared, and those that won that city

Auratus' alteration is a very easy one, I have thought it safer to follow the other editors in adopting it.

1245. *κορείσης*. See the end of the note on v. 674.

1251. Hermann was the first to remove this verse from its place after v. 1257, and fix it here, in which all the editors except Haupt have followed him. Its irrelevancy in the one place and its perfect suitability in the other are the sole reasons for the change ; but when all that can be urged against them is "versuum transponendorum rationem semper dubitationi valde obnoxiam esse jam supra diximus," they may perhaps be esteemed sufficient.

1253. "Before the house" (from Schutz) is perhaps not an adequate translation of *κάτοικος*, but there is no occasion for supposing it corrupt with Dindorf and others, or making it mean, with Klausen, strictly in the house, which he explains by representing the court as part of the house, so that while in one sense

she was *θυραῖος*, in another she was *κάτοικος*. Paley seems right in rendering it "*apud ædes*," which might be applied to her though she had not yet entered the house. He is wrong however in taking it with *ἔδ'*, though supported by Blomfield and Peile, as the harmony of the line would be utterly spoiled by admitting any pause between *ἔδ'* and *ἀναστένω*. Peile and Dindorf are right, after Schutz and Wellauer, in putting the note of interrogation at the end of this line.

1255. Peile is right, against Klausen and Paley, in referring *οἱ δ' εἶχον πόλιν* to the conquerors, as in v. 309, not to the inhabitants, thus avoiding what would be a mere tautology (not to mention that there would then be no force in *τὸ πρῶτον*, unless *πράξασαν* were understood of the former prosperity of the city), and putting into Cassandra's mouth an additional reason for meeting her fate.



οὕτως ἀπαλλάσσουσιν ἐν θεῶν κρίσει,  
 ἰοῦσα πράξω, τλήσομαι τὸ κατθανεῖν.  
 Αἴδου πύλας δὲ τάσδ' ἐγὼ προσεννέπω.  
 ἐπεύχομαι δὲ καιρίας πληγῆς τυχεῖν,  
 ὥς ἀσφάδαστος, αἱμάτων εὐθνησίμων  
 ἀπορρυνέντων, ὄμμα συμβάλω τόδε.

1260

ΧΟ. ὦ πολλὰ μὲν τάλαινα, πολλὰ δ' αὖ σοφὴ  
 γύναι, μακρὰν ἔτεινας· εἰ δ' ἐτητύμως  
 μόρον τὸν αὐτῆς οἶσθα, πῶς, θεηλάτου  
 βοὸς δίκην, πρὸς βωμὸν εὐτόλμως πατεῖς ;

1265

ΚΑ. οὐκ ἔστ' ἄλυξις, οὐ, ξένοι, χρόνῳ πλέω.

ΧΟ. ὁ δ' ὕστατός γε τοῦ χρόνου πρεσβεύεται.

ΚΑ. ἦκει τόδ' ἡμαρ· σμικρὰ κερδανῶ φυγῇ.

ΧΟ. ἀλλ' ἴσθι τλήμων οὐσ' ἀπ' εὐτόλμου φρενός.

1257. The use of τὸ κατθανεῖν here shows that the infinitive in a connection like this is really a noun, governed by what is ordinarily considered a neuter verb. Is there more than an accidental coincidence between τὸ, the neuter article, and our prefix *to*? Spenser's often quoted lines, "For not *to* have been dipped in Lethe's lake Could save the son of Thetis from *to* die," would thus be something more than a mere Grecism.

1266. None of the conjectures proposed in place of χρόνῳ πλέω are satisfactory. Pearson's χρόνῳ πλέων, adopted by Wellauer and Peile, does not give a very ready sense, as it must be supposed to stand for οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλυξις ἐν τῷ χρονίζεσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ ἐν τῷ δέχεσθαι τὴν τύχην. Schutz's χρόνου πλέων, whether understood to mean with Symmons, "No feet can swifter than Time's hourglass run," or as he would render it himself, "non magis est auxilii ac salutis quam temporis ad elabendum copia," will hardly be thought to compensate for the change which it intro-

duces by any great felicity of its own, though it has had the good fortune to be received by Blomfield. Hermann's χρόνον πλέω, which Paley has received, is objectionable as not giving that force to the word χρόνος which the reply of the Chorus shows that it must have had in Cassandra's speech. Pauw's χρόνῳ πλέον, if understood οὐκ ἔστι χρόνῳ πλέον, "nothing more is to be gained by time," is better:—but the common reading, as explained by Rost, gives the same sense, πλέω being put for πλείονα. I have therefore retained the latter, though it is but a choice of evils: nor have I sought to make my translation less harsh and obscure than the original. The sense is sufficiently apt, and answers well to the next line.

1267. τοῦ χρόνου may undoubtedly be joined with πρεσβεύεται, the genitive "in respect of" being as suitable here as the dative "in point of." The passage from the Choe-phoræ however (v. 631), κακῶν δὲ πρεσβεύεται τὸ Λήμνιον λόγῳ, though quoted by most of the editors, is

Thus in the judgment of the gods come off—  
 I'll go and suffer—I'll submit to die:  
 But here I call upon these gates of hell—  
 My prayer is to obtain a homestruck blow,  
 That without struggle, from the gush of blood  
 In easy dying I may close these eyes!

CHO. O much in suffering, much in wisdom too,  
 Maid, thou hast talked at length: but if in truth  
 Thou knowest of thine own fate, how, like a heifer  
 Heavenled, thus boldly walk'st thou to the shrine?

CASS. There's no escape—nought, strangers, more by time.

CHO. Aye, but the last in time is vantaged most.

CASS. The day is come: scant were my gain by flight.

CHO. Well, know thou art bold, with a courageous soul.

really nothing to the point, as the genitive there expresses not the *matter in which* precedence is gained, but the *parties among which* it is gained, and the word λόγῳ would rather confirm Schutz's τῷ χρόνῳ here. It would be possible to join τοῦ χρόνου with ὁ ὕστατος, but the rhythm is rather against it, though ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ, or something of the kind, must be understood to complete the sense, "The last in time is best in a question of time." τοῦ χρόνου is more general, "when time is the question:" τῷ χρόνῳ would be more specific, implying that the particular point in which the superiority was gained was time. It might also mean, "is better off by the delay," i. e. by the fact of the delay, much in the same way as σμικρὰ κερδανῶ φυγῇ in the next line. For the general sentiment, in addition to the passages collected by the editors, we may compare the Cyclops' boon to Ulysses in the Odyssey.

1269. τλήμων seems to imply resolution rather than misery, though of course with the notion of the cause being a desperate one, like τλήσομαι τὸ κατθανεῖν just above, v.

1257: and ἀπ' εὐτόλμου φρενὸς is constructed like ἀπ' ἄκρας φρενὸς, v. 774, expressing the seat of the feeling. The Chorus, finding that they cannot persuade Cassandra, attempt to console her by their praise of her resolution. She, equally unwilling to avoid her fate and to gloss over its misery, replies that this is not the way men talk to the happy, implying that the very fact of consolation shows there is wretchedness to be consoled. The Chorus, still wishing to comfort her, argues that surely there is something in what men say when they talk of a glorious death as a boon—Cassandra's thoughts instantly fly to the death of her father and his noble sons, as the experience she has had of what is called so glorious, the death of the brave.—I have given this explanation in order to justify my retaining the order of vv. 1270, 71, as it stood before Heath reversed it. Every one of the recent editors is against me, except Haupt, who has mistaken the sense of the first verse, and perhaps Paley, whose note seems to show that he considers οὐδεὶς ἀκούει to be said by Cassandra, though

ΚΑ. οὐδεὶς ἀκούει ταῦτα τῶν εὐδαιμόνων.

1270

ΧΟ. ἀλλ' εὐκλεῶς τοι κατθανεῖν χάρις βροτῷ.

ΚΑ. ἰὼ, πάτερ, σοῦ, τῶν τε γενναίων τέκνων.

ΧΟ. τί δ' ἐστὶ χρήμα; τίς σ' ἀποστρέφει φόβος;

ΚΑ. φεῦ φεῦ.

ΧΟ. τί τοῦτ' ἔφευξας, εἴ τι μὴ φρενῶν στύγος;

1275

ΚΑ. φόνον δόμοι πνέουσιν αἵματοσταγῇ.

ΧΟ. καὶ πῶς; τόδ' ὅξει θυμάτων ἐφεστίων.

ΚΑ. ὅμοιος ἀτμός ὥσπερ ἐκ τάφου πρέπει.

ΧΟ. οὐ Σύριον ἀγλαΐσμα δώμασιν λέγεις.

ΚΑ. ἀλλ' εἴμι, κὰν δόμοισι κωκύσουσ' ἐμὴν

1280

Ἀγαμέμνονός τε μοῖραν. ἀρκείτω βίος.

ἰὼ ξένοι.

οὗ τοι δυσοίζω, θάμνον ὡς ὄρνις, φόβῳ

ἄλλως· θανούσῃ μαρτυρεῖτέ μοι τόδε,

ὅταν γυνὴ γυναικὸς ἀντ' ἐμοῦ θάνῃ,

1285

ἀνὴρ τε δυσδάμαρτος ἀντ' ἀνδρὸς πέσῃ.

ἐπιξενούμαι ταῦτα δ' ὡς θανουμένη.

in his text he gives it to the Chorus. Heath's transposition was the more readily received by succeeding editors, as they connected τῶν εὐδαιμόνων with ἀκούει, as in Prom. 1054. τοιάδε μέντοι τῶν φρενοπλήκτων βουλεύματ' ἔπη τ' ἐστὶν ἀκοῦσαι, discarding Stanley's rendering, "nemo feliciū hęc audit."—Pauw had shown his ignorance of the sense by proposing to read ἀλεύει for ἀκούει, which Potter afterwards followed, translating "None of the happy shuns his destined end."—Butler questioned the transposition, but not being able to make any thing of the line as it stood, wished to read δυσδαιμόνων, meaning, I suppose, "This is not the language of sympathy, but of superiority." It is strange however that Klausen and Peile, the one of whom proposes, the other adopts, the right translation of this line,

"De nemine hoc dicitur qui felicem adeptus est sortem," should not have seen that the transposition thus became completely unnecessary. Dr. Arnold first showed me that this was the case, and further looking into the passage only convinces me further that Æschylus wrote it as it stands. The words ἀλλ' εὐκλεῶς τοι κατθανεῖν χάρις βροτῷ could never have been put by him into the mouth of Cassandra, who is as far as possible from the common view of a glorious death, and indeed shows in her next speech very plainly what feelings such a thought suggests to her. The English translators have followed the course of the commentators: of the Germans, two at least, Voss and Droysen, have been more independent, though the latter, by not understanding that v. 1269 is really meant as a conso-

CASS. No words are these for happy folk to hear.

CHO. But to die nobly is a boon for man.

CASS. O! father, O for thee and thy brave sons!

CHO. What is it now? what horror drives thee back?

CASS. Fah! fah!

CHO. Why fah'st thou thus, unless thou'rt sick at heart?

CASS. The house all breathes of murderous drops of blood.

CHO. How so? this smells of victims at the hearth.

CASS. 'Tis such a fume as rises from the grave.

CHO. No Syrian luxury nam'st thou for the house.

CASS. Well, I will go and wail within my own  
And Agamemnon's fate. Thus much for life.

Ah, strangers!

I quail not, as a bird does at a bush,

From useless fear: attest me this when dead,

When for myself, a woman, dies a woman,

And for a man ill-mated falls a man.

This courtesy I ask as soon to die.

lation, has been led into the mistake of rendering ἀκούει ταῦτα "begreifen kaun das," and so mistaking the persons intended by εὐδαιμόνων.

1278. πρέπει is generally taken "strikes on my sense," (compare the note on v. 30.) thus making the expression ὁμοιος ὥσπερ ἐκ τάφου pleonastic: but it may equally well be taken in its more ordinary sense, the construction being ὁμοιος ἀτμὸς ἔστι ὥσπερ (equivalent to ἐκείνῳ ὄν-περ) ἐκ τάφου πρέπει εἶναι.

1283. Paley refers to Shilleto (Demosth. Fals. Leg. §. 27) for the right interpretation of this line, the limed bird "misdoubting every bush:" but it has been already noticed by Medwin, though with the unnecessary addition of construing θάμνος a twig. Sewell too has adduced the parallel passage from Shakspeare, 3 Hen. VI. Act 5. Sc. 6.

1284. Peile's version shows the

necessity of ἄλλως to complete the sense of the preceding line, the stress being laid on Cassandra's starting expression of horror not being groundless: and the absence of ἀλλὰ is equally required, as τόδε can plainly refer only to what has just preceded. The correction was originally proposed by Hermann in his appendix to Humboldt's version.

1287. ἐπιξενοῦμαι has been clearly proved by the express testimony of Hesychius, compared with the account given by him and other grammarians of the kindred words ξεινοδόκος, ξεινοδοκοῦμαι, to be connected with the notion of witness: and Butler cannot be far wrong in referring it to the mutual pledges given by host and guest, which, as Klausen remarks, would be especially fulfilled by the one bearing evidence, should need arise, to the character of the other. Butler how-

ΧΟ. ὦ τλήμον, οἰκτείρω σε θεσφάτου μόρου.

ΚΑ. ἅπαξ ἔτ' εἰπεῖν ῥῆσιν ἢ θρήνον θέλω  
 ἐμὸν τὸν αὐτῆς. ἡλίῳ δ' ἐπεύχομαι 1290  
 πρὸς ὕστατον φῶς, τοῖς ἐμοῖς τιμαόροις,  
 ἐχθροῖς φονεῦσι τοῖς ἐμοῖς τίνειν ὁμοῦ,  
 δούλης θανούσης εὐμαροῦς χειρώματος.  
 ἰὼ βρότεια πράγματ'· εὐτυχοῦντα μὲν  
 σκιά τις ἂν τρέψειεν· εἰ δὲ δυστυχῇ, 1295  
 βολαῖς ὑγρώσσω σπὸ γγος ὤλεσεν γραφήν.  
 καὶ ταῦτ' ἐκείνων μᾶλλον οἰκτείρω πολύ.

ΧΟ. τὸ μὲν εὖ πράσσειν ἀκόρεστον ἔφν  
 πᾶσι βροτοῖσιν· δακτυλοδεικτῶν δ'

ever seems mistaken in supposing that the sense here is "I pledge my faith as a guest to the truth of these things, as one about to die," as both the sense of μαρτύρομαι, the supposed equivalent of the word, and the context requires that we should take it as Cassandra's concluding appeal, "This evidence I ask as a courtesy, as one soon to die."

1290. I cannot do better than follow Peile in transcribing Klausen's whole note, as containing what I believe to be substantially the true explanation of this passage: "ἐπεύχεσθαι duplici sensu cum dativo jungi solet, tum invocandi, (ut τοιαῦτ' ἐπεύχου θεοῖς Theb. 279, cf. Soph. Phil. 1470, Œd. Col. 1024) tum imprecandi, ut v. 459 (482), illud dei hoc hominis ratione habita. Utrumque hoc loco junxit poeta: deus, qui invocatur, est sol. hominis, quibus imprecatur Cassandra, sunt ultores: utroque dativo casu positi. Id quod imprecatur additur accusativo positum, verbum τίνειν. Ab hoc pendet dativus alteri, ἐχθροῖς φονεῦσι τοῖς ἐμοῖς. Precibus quibus solem in ultima luce" (I would rather render it

*ad ultimam lucem conversa*, addressing, or looking to his last light) "*invoco, imprecor ultoribus meis ut occisoribus invisitis meis idem solvant.*" —ἐπεύχεσθαι est vox media pariter atque imprecari: imprecari potes bona et mala, Cassandra imprecatur vindicibus facilem victoriam. τίνειν quidem dici solet de eo qui *pœnam solvit* (Ch. 313. Eum. 268): at τίνειν omnino est *debitum reddere, debitum solvere* v. 754 (791): quod quia ad ultorem, qui debitam infligit pœnam transferatur non est quod impediatur." Compare Soph. Œd. Col. 229. οὐδενὶ μοιριδία τίσις ἔρχεται ὄν προπάθη τὸ τίνειν, where τίνειν clearly refers to the avenger. τίνειν ὁμοῦ is equivalent to τίνειν ὁμοιον χρέος. δούλης may either be, as Klausen thinks, in apposition to ἐμοῦ understood from τοῖς ἐμοῖς, or an ordinary genitive absolute.

1295. ἀντρέψειεν, the old reading, might doubtless stand, according to the principles advocated on v. 308, &c.: but where a correction is so easy as Porson's ἂν τρέψειεν is here, it is difficult not to adopt it, for the sake of introducing what is cer-

CHO. Poor maid! I pity thee thy destined fate.

CASS. Yet once again a word or dirge I'd speak  
For my own self. My prayer is to the sun,  
Looking at his last light, for my avengers,  
That they may pay my hated murderers back  
When I, poor slave, have fallen, an easy victim.  
O the frail state of mortals! when 'tis well  
A shade might turn it: but should misery come,  
The sponge's sprinkling blots the picture out.  
And 'tis this case I pity more than that.

CHO. Success is a thing which can never glut  
Mankind: and none will against it shut

tainly the more usual construction of the optative. With *δυστυχῆ* the case is different, as none of the alterations proposed are sufficiently plausible to outweigh the probability that this, like other passages, (e. g. *Eum.* 234) is an instance of the use of *εἰ* with the conjunctive, rare, if not unknown, in more recent writers, but offending against no known law of language, and so not lightly to be altered in an author like *Æschylus*.—The sense of the whole has been rightly understood by Peile, who however stands almost alone in his opinion:—"The train of thought suggested by the preceding reflection *εὐμαρὸς χειρώματος* is, that man at his best estate is altogether vanity; and that easy as is his fall from prosperous to adverse circumstances, a yet more fatal change hangs over him. There is but a step between him and death: from a state of adversity the work of a moment is sufficient to reduce him to a state of absolute nothingness—and this last change, the speaker adds, I deplore much more than that." This is both infinitely more poetical than any of the other explanations

(such for instance as that proposed by Schutz and revived by Klausen, the common-place remark that men easily forget the lessons of adversity), and better suited to the context: as a thought about the speedy forgetting of misfortunes would be apropos to nothing, unless it is the misfortunes of *others*, which men are said soon to forget, as Klausen seems to think, an observation which would then be levelled, though not very reasonably, at the Chorus: while it is most natural to suppose that Cassandra in her last moments may have thought of the two stages through which she had herself passed or was then passing:—the one from prosperity to adversity, the other from adversity to absolute extinction.

1299. It is somewhat strange that so few of the editors should have acquiesced in the natural meaning of this passage, as explained by Wellauer, Haupt, and Peile, "*ab ædibus quamvis divitibus, nemo fortunam accedentem arcet, eamque intrare vetat*," where the personification of good Fortune is quite after the manner of *Æschylus*. Casaubon was the

οὔτις ἀπειπὼν εἵργει μελάθρων,  
 Μηκέτ' ἐσέλθης, τάδε φωνῶν.  
 καὶ τῷδε πόλιν μὲν ἐλεῖν ἔδοσαν  
 μάκαρες Πριάμου,  
 θεοτίμητος δ' οἴκαδ' ἰκάνει.  
 νῦν δ' εἰ προτέρων αἰμ' ἀποτίσει,  
 καὶ τοῖσι θανούσι θανὼν ἄλλων  
 ποινὰς θανάτων †[ἄγαν] ἐπικρανεῖ,  
 τίς ἂν οὐκ εὔξαιτο βροτῶν ἀσινεῖ  
 δαίμονι φῦναι, τάδ' ἀκούων;

1300

1305

ΑΓ. ὦμοι, πέπληγμαι καιρίαν πληγὴν ἔσω.

1310

Χ. α'. σίγα· τίς πληγὴν αὐτεῖ καιρίως οὐτασμένος;

first to disturb the text by reading *δακτυλοδεικτὸν*, which has been adopted by Schutz, Blomfield, and Dindorf, and approved by Porson (as appears from his obelizing *δακτυλοδεικτῶν*) and Paley, though even then there is a question about the sense, as if *δακτυλοδεικτὸν* is supposed to be equivalent to *τὸν εὖ πράσσοντα*, which in the absence of the article cannot well be admitted, it does not appear whether we are to render the words, "No one refuses to receive the rich man as a guest," as Symmons understood them, or "No one warns the rich man against entering his own palace any longer," i. e. against indulging any further in prosperity: while on the other hand Paley makes *δακτυλοδεικτὸν* agree with *τὸ εὖ πράσσειν*, and would construe it "as a finger-pointed or scorned thing," an explanation more in accordance with the famous passage in *Othello* than with the general use of this and similar expressions by the Greeks and Romans, who evidently looked upon the "*digito monstrari*" as a mark of admiration, so that *cæteris paribus* in a classical author it must be taken in a good sense. Lobeck

makes *δακτυλοδεικτῶν* a verb, as it is in the passage from Demosthenes c. Aristogit. quoted by Stanley (a passage by the way which shows that when finger-pointing in a bad sense is spoken of, such an intention is specified in the context). Lastly, Klausen would understand the common reading in the sense mentioned above as applicable to *δακτυλοδεικτὸν*, "No one warns (the rich man) against entering the splendid palace any longer, lest he should provoke Nemesis:" but it is scarcely natural thus to represent Agamemnon's entering the palace (which Klausen supposes to be expressly intended) as the *cause* of his death, even if the Chorus could be imagined to have so clear an insight into what was about to happen as to know that he was on the point of meeting his fate within those walls.

1307. *ἄγαν ἐπικρανεῖ* is of course corrupt. Hermann, followed by Bothe, Haupt and Paley, omits *ἄγαν* (which Bothe and Haupt ingeniously transfer to the next line in the place of *ἂν*) and reads *ἐπικραίνει*. Dindorf adopts the first part of the suggestion but not the second, supposing



The door of the hall pointed out by all,  
 Crying out, No longer enter :—  
 So here on our king have the gods bestowed  
 Their prize, the capture of Priam's town.  
 And dowered by them with the glorious crown  
 Of praise, he is come to his own abode :—  
 But now, should the blood aforetime shed  
 Bid him render his own to content the dead  
 For other men's deaths, as a debt to Fate,  
 Who would not pray for unharmed estate,  
 When he hears such ill-starred venture ?

Ag. O ! I am struck a deadly blow within !

1Cho. Silence—who is there exclaiming, struck, as with a  
 deadly wound ?

that the penultimate of *ἐνικραβεῖ* may be long : but it is more probable that in Eum. 950, to which he refers, *ἐνικραβεῖ* is a mistake for *ἐνικραβεῖς*, as Pauw suggests. "Sed ista vox (*ἀγαν*) non de nihilo irrepsit," says Blomfield; and certainly, though the two principal MSS., Flor. and Ven., omit it, it is scarcely credible that Triclinius should have gone out of his way to introduce it, under the notion that he was improving the metre. Blomfield himself, with Klausen and Peile, has adopted *ἀγαν τε κραβεῖ*, a suggestion of H. Voss : but *ἀγαν* is not at all wanted, and rather serves to weaken the sense. Bamberger's proposal, *ἀντενικραβεῖς*, is very probable, as the compound is both well suited to the sense, and at the same time likely to have been altered by the copyists, being an unusual word.

1308. *οὐκ*, inserted by Canter, is, as Peile remarks, necessary both to the metre and to the sense. Those who supply the deficient syllable in any other way (e. g. *τίς*, *τίς ἄν*. Musgr., *τίς ἄν οὐν* Porson, *βροτὸς ἄν* Bothe ed. 1. Butler, *ἀνθρώπων* Klausen)

understand the meaning to be, "What mortal after this can dare to boast of security?" but such a thought is not a natural conclusion to the reflections of the Chorus, which do not turn on the *chances* of life, but the dangers of prosperity, as the very first words show. Fortune, as the goddess of chance, does not enter into Æschylus' view of human affairs : on the contrary, he regards them as regulated by a moral law ; and, according to him, the man who has "a part free from sorrow" (v. 367), who enjoys "unenvied bliss" (v. 454), need not be dismayed or feel his security affected by the overthrow of the great. *ἀσυνῆς δαίμων* probably includes both an active and a passive sense : the main thing to be wished for is "unharmed estate," a lot free from *σίνος* : but as it is those who are pests to others, the killers of men and sackers of cities, that bring down pests on themselves, "rendering their own blood to content the dead," the blessing must be sought by praying for an inoffensive, lowly condition.

1311—1338. "In his versibus sin-



ΑΓ. ὦμοι μάλ' αὖθις, δευτέραν πεπληγμένος.

Χ. β'. τοῦργον εἰργάσθαι δοκεῖ μοι βασιλέως οἰμώγματι.

Χ. γ'. ἀλλὰ κοινωσώμεθ' ἄν πως ἀσφαλῇ βουλεύματα.

Χ. δ'. ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμῖν τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην λέγω,

1315

πρὸς δῶμα δεῦρ' ἀστοῖσι κηρύσσειν βοήν.

gulas chori personas loquentes introduci manifestum est, monuitque Hermannus Opusc. vol. 2. p. 131, præeunte Scholiasta Aristophanis Equit. 586, qui ut quindecim chori tragici personas fuisse demonstret, Æschyli Agamemnonis exemplo utitur." Dindorf. Klausen, Peile and Paley adopt Müller's supposition, making the number of the Chorus *twelve*, and distributed the iambic distichs among them. The whole subject is discussed by Müller (Eumenides, p. 55 &c. Eng. trans.) and Hermann (Recension v. Müller's Eumeniden Opusc. vol. 6. pt. 2. p. 136 &c.). The arguments drawn by Müller from other parts of the play where twelve persons seem to be speaking singly, or in pairs, have been retorted by Hermann, and also by the Quarterly Reviewer of Peile's Choephoreæ (Q. R. vol. 70. p. 323), each of whom thinks the arrangement of the Choral speeches in the dialogue favourable to the hypothesis of *fifteen*; but the ease of the retort shows that nothing definite can be made of such considerations, and besides we have no right to suppose that in those passages the several members of the Chorus speak in turn. The present passage is the only one upon which we can so argue; and as Hermann's theory is at least as suitable to it as Müller's, the external evidence of the Scholiast may be allowed to decide the question, according to the sentence given by Dindorf.

1314. Klausen is the only editor who has defended κοινωσώμεθ' ἄν as

it stands, as a remnant of the Homeric usage of ἄν. Paley says, "Nequeo satis mirari eorum temeritatem qui portentosam structuram tueri velunt tanquam vestigium usus Homericum, quum is usus particulæ cum subjunctivo et tragici sermonis rationi et linguæ Atticæ legibus plane repugnet." Are we however as a matter of fact sufficiently acquainted with the Attic dialect in its several stages to entitle us to say, that a usage which has the authority of Homer is impossible in Æschylus? Or how can we say that the use of ἄν with the subjunctive is necessarily contrary to the *laws of language*, when no complaint is made of such a combination after ὅπως or ὥς, and εἰάν or ἤν, which is clearly connected with ἄν, is, so far as we know, invariably followed by that mood? Till these questions can be answered satisfactorily, an editor may be pardoned for retaining the reading of the MSS. and early editions, in preference either to Paley's ἤν πως (γένηται), Peile's attempt to understand ἄν πως in the same sense, Porson's κοινωσαίμεθ', adopted by Blomfield and Dindorf, or Haupt's proposal, in case ἄν πως ἀσφαλῇ be not considered equivalent to ἤν πως ἀσφαλῇ ἦ, to substitute for ἄν πως ἀπλῶς or αὐτοῖς.—The demerits of the conversation which follows, in a dramatical or artistical point of view, have been too frequently canvassed to require much notice here. It is obvious that they are all traceable, as has been remarked in the Preface, to the fact of the existence of a

Ag. O me, again! wounded a second time!

2 Cho. It is done, the deed, I take it, by the groaning of the king.

3 Cho. But let us take counsel somehow and concert a safe design.

4 Cho. Well, for my part, I give you my opinion,  
To call the townsmen here to the house for help.

Chorus at all, the weakness of which is sure to be perceived whenever any stage emergency comes in, such as the commission of a murder, which is required to take place behind the scenes. If we make allowance for the original fault, which compelled Æschylus to this absurdity of not permitting the Chorus to rush to the rescue at once, we shall have no reason to complain of anything else in his management of the scene. When the doubt once arises that paralyzes action, all that follows is but natural. One old man bids his comrades cry help: another would rush at once to the spot: a third is bewildered, and can only make out that something should be done without delay: this others take up and refuse to waste time in lingering: then they feel that as the deed is done by this time it is hard to say what steps to take, till a more energetic speaker asks if they will allow themselves to be overridden by tyrants and murderers: when at last some one raises the question whether they have sufficient grounds for concluding that murder has been done, and this is sufficient to detain them till Clytæmnestra is discovered with the axe in her hand. Everything is in accordance with nature, except the first suggestion of stopping to deliberate: and this was forced on Æschylus by the nature of the work he had to do. The conduct of Euripides in similar cases

has been justly compared, or rather contrasted with the present scene. In the Medea, when the cries of the children are heard, the Chorus talks of rushing to their assistance, but though the children exclaim that there is no time to be lost, it thinks better of it, and contents itself with making an appeal to Medea from the stage. So in the Hippolytus, the proposal of one half of the Chorus to rescue Phædra is actually overruled by the other, on the ground that it is the business of others to do it, and that no good comes from meddling out of one's own sphere. The one poet does his utmost to conceal the defect which he cannot avoid: the other dwells on it, and even aggravates it. Sophocles, with characteristic judgment, has nowhere in his extant plays brought himself within its range. Ajax, Jocasta, and Deianira die without the knowledge of the Chorus: Clytæmnestra's cries are heard, but the Chorus is friendly to Electra, and has no wish to interpose.

1316. βοή is originally the cry for help: then the help brought in answer to the cry, as in Suppl. 682, Hom. Od. XXII. 132, quoted by several of the editors, and the Homeric βοήν ἀγαθόν, which will thus exactly correspond to Scott's "good at need." This explanation, which nearly coincides with Peile's, seems better than Klausen's, who makes

Χ. ε'. ἐμοὶ δ' ὅπως τάχιστα γ' ἐμπεσεῖν δοκεῖ,  
καὶ πρᾶγμ' ἐλέγχειν ξὺν νεορρύντῳ ξίφει.

Χ. ς'. καγὼ, τοιούτου γνώματος κοινωνὸς ὢν,  
ψηφίζομαί τι δρᾶν· τὸ μὴ μέλλειν δ' ἀκμή. 1320

Χ. ζ'. ὁρᾶν πάρεστι· φροιμιάζονται γὰρ ὡς  
τυραννίδος σημεῖα πράσσοντες πόλει.

Χ. η'. χρονίζομεν γάρ· οἱ δὲ τῆς μελλοῦς κλέος  
πέδον πατοῦντες, οὐ καθεύδουσιν χερί.

Χ. θ'. οὐκ οἶδα βουλῆς ἥστινος τυχὼν λέγω.  
τοῦ δρῶντός ἐστι καὶ τὸ βουλευῆσαι περι. 1325

Χ. ι'. καγὼ τοιοῦτός εἰμ', ἐπεὶ δυσμηχανῶ  
λόγοισι τὸν θανόντ' ἀνιστάναι πάλιν.

Χ. ια'. ἢ καὶ βίον τείνοντες ὧδ' ὑπειξομεν  
δόμων κατασχυντήρσι τοῖσδ' ἡγουμένοις; 1330

Χ. ιβ'. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀνεκτὸν, ἀλλὰ κατθανεῖν κρατεῖ·  
πεπαιτέρα γὰρ μοῖρα τῆς τυραννίδος.

Χ. ιγ'. ἢ γὰρ τεκμηρίοισιν ἐξ οἰμωγμάτων  
μαντευσόμεσθα τάνδρὸς ὡς ὀλωλότος;

the cry that of the people who come to the rescue. A passage like the present is just one of those which shows the transition between two senses of a word.

1318. πρᾶγμ' ἐλέγχειν facinus arguere (Paley), convict the fact: i. e. ascertain the fact and convict the guilty. Νεορρύντος clearly cannot mean new-drawn: and Klausen's objection, that the Chorus could not tell whether Clytæmnestra had used a sword, is frivolous in the extreme; as if their thoughts would not fly at once to the usual instrument of death, which they would name without hesitation, at the risk of a mistake, in case they wished to speak of a weapon. The use of ξὺν may be compared with ταύτῃ σὺν ὁρμῇ καμὲ συνθανεῖν ἄμα, Soph. Trach.

720, ξὺν ἔργῳ ἀπειλήσας, Œd. C. 817. ὄλοντο . . . σὺν μιάσματι, Ant. 172, in all of which the sense answers to that of the English word *coincidentally*.

1321. Paley reads ὧς, with Wel-lauer, and adopts Bothe's contorted explanation, joining ὧς with πράσσοντες, while he maintains πράσσειν σημεῖα not to be Greek. He makes no attempt however to prove his charge: and it is difficult to see why σημεῖα τυραννίδος, or actions symptomatic of tyranny, may not be regarded as subjects of πράξις, even in the strict Aristotelian sense, which distinguished it from ποίησις. πράσσειν σημεῖα then will be equivalent to πράσσειν πράγματα σημαντικά.

- 5 CHO. I think we should fall on without delay,  
And probe the matter while the sword is wet.
- 6 CHO. And I, concurring in some such resolve,  
Vote we do something: no delay's the thing.
- 7 CHO. Aye, we may see it: these their preludes show  
They are practising as tyrants for the state.
- 8 CHO. True! for *we* linger: *they* tread under foot  
Care for delay, nor are their hands asleep.
- 9 CHO. Well, I can't tell on what resolve I speak:—  
Yet 'tis the doer's part to have resolved.
- 10 CHO. I share your case: for I despair of skill  
To raise the dead again to life by words.
- 11 CHO. And are we then to stretch out life beneath  
These rulers, who have made the house a shame?
- 12 CHO. No! 'tis not bearable: 'twere best to die,  
For death is milder sure than tyranny.
- 13 CHO. Well!—but can proof enough be drawn from groans  
To make us augur that the man is dead?

1326. There can be no doubt that Scholefield's interpretation of this line, "Qui aliquid facturū sit eum etiam prius deliberare decet de re gerenda," is right, against Blomfield's ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ βουλευσαί περὶ τοῦ δρώντος, and Klausen's τοῦ δρώντος ἐστὶ (βουλῇ), περὶ τὸ βουλευσαί (quod ad censendum attinet). The sense in connection with what follows, has been substantially explained by Peile;—though there are still one or two points not clearly brought out. Τυχὼν λέγω has an emphasis, which, if properly attended to, will sufficiently explain what follows. Literally it is, "I know not what opinion having struck out I now speak,"—where the use of the past participle implies that before speaking it is usual for a man to have made up his mind: and the next line enforces the necessity of this, "For to take counsel is also the province of the doer:" i. e. the doer

cannot excuse himself from *first* taking counsel, (which, as Peile remarks, may be the force of the aorist βουλευσαί,) on the plea that it belongs to some other person. Thus the general sense is, "Well, I cannot say that I have made up my mind: and this is a fatal confession for one who would wish to act." The next speaker naturally chimes in, "And I am just in the same case (i. e. I have to make the same fatal confession), for I see no way of restoring the dead to life by talking," meaning, "I see so clearly the impossibility of resolving any thing practically, that I must be content to make the same admission, though by doing so I should own myself disqualified for action." From this state of confusion and bewilderment arising from the number of questions raised, the succeeding speaker wishes to rouse his comrades by his indignant appeal.

Χ. ιδ'. σάφ' εἰδότες χρὴ τῶνδε μυθοῦσθαι περί·  
τὸ γὰρ τοπάζειν τοῦ σάφ' εἰδέναι δίχα.

1335

Χ. ιέ'. ταύτην ἐπαινεῖν πάντοθεν πληθύνομαι,  
τρανώς Ἀτρείδην εἰδέναι κυροῦνθ' ὅπως.

ΚΛ. πολλῶν πάροιθεν καιρίως εἰρημένων,  
τάναντί' εἰπεῖν οὐκ ἐπαισχυνθήσομαι.

1340

πῶς γάρ τις ἐχθροῖς ἐχθρὰ πορσύνων, φίλοις  
δοκοῦσιν εἶναι, πημονὴν ἀρκύστατον  
φράζειεν, ὕψος κρεῖσσον ἐκπηδήματος;

1337. Dindorf seems to be right in recalling the old reading *πληθύνομαι*, as having been unnecessarily changed into *πληθύομαι* by Porson. The strict meaning of the words then will be, "I am multiplied on all sides," a sort of exaggeration to express the readiness with which the speaker throws all his weight into this particular scale, which may be rendered in English as I have rendered it, "This is the side I choose with all my votes," and in Latin, "Hanc in sententiam omnibus pedibus transeo." In the next line *κυροῦνθ' ὅπως* is nothing more than a case of attraction for *ὅπως κυρεῖ*, as Blomfield explains it, a favorite mode of expression with the Greeks, as shown among many instances by the two Peile quotes, Soph. Aj. 103, ἡ τοῦπίτριπτον κίναδος ἐξήρου μ' ὅπου; 890. ἀλλ' ἀμενηνὸν ἄνδρα μὴ λεύσσειν ὅπου. Peile and Paley, in drawing out the expression fully, *κυροῦνθ' ὅπως κυρεῖ*, have lost sight of the fact that *ὅπως* is plainly meant to be an *\*interrogative*, not a simple relative, like *ὅπου* in the two cases above cited: and their attempts to explain it by *as he is*, or *however he is*, *ὅπως αν κυρῇ*, are quite foreign

to the purpose.—The literal rendering would be "to know Atrides being *how*?" where the postponement of the question till the end of the sentence reminds us of the usual explanation of οἶσθ' ὃ δρᾶσον as δρᾶσον οἶσθ' ὃ. That which makes the present passage more difficult than others of the kind is, that there the Greeks were content to put the person spoken of only in the accusative, while here the particular in which information concerning him is sought is put into the accusative too, leaving only the interrogative in the subjoined clause. The sense is of course the same, whether the mind first looks at the person, and then at a particular respecting him, or looks at the particular at once, just as in our early English writers we often see the genitive resolved into two distinct objects, "I sing of Achilles, his wrath," the latter serving to give speciality to the former:—only here confusion arises from the person and the particular being both put into the formal accusative, as if the subjoined clause, which is really only the accusative under another phase, could be altogether dispensed with.

\* The interrogative can undoubtedly be resolved into a simple relative with its antecedent; but in that case we must suppose a double object to the verb, "to know Atrides, the condition in which he is," a construction which is not expressed by the words "to know him to be as he is," any more than ἀμενηνὸν ἄνδρα μὴ λεύσσειν ὅπου means, "that I cannot see a man, so powerful as he is, in the place in which he is." It would scarcely have been worth while to examine so trifling a matter so closely, but for the objections raised against Blomfield's explanation, as incorrect and unsatisfactory.

14 CHO. Clear knowledge we should have, before we talk,  
For guessing and clear knowledge are two things.

15 CHO. This is the side I choose with all my votes,  
To know for certain how Atrides fares.

CLY. Though much was said before to suit the time,  
I shall not blush to speak the contrary:  
For how should one who were to deal with foes  
As foes, though seeming friends, hedge vengeance  
round,

A net too high for mortal to o'erleap?

1341. The commentators generally have agreed to render πῶς γὰρ κ. τ. λ. "for how *else* should one," &c., but this need not be done if we lay a proper stress on ἐχθρὰ, and translate, "for how if one were to treat enemies as enemies," i. e. not to use dissimulation and words suited to the time, "while they appeared as friends, could one hedge round vengeance as a net, a height too great for overleaping," in other words, successfully entrap them? Klausen is apparently the only one who has seen that this is the sense of the passage. Πημονῆς ἀρκύστατ' ἄν, the combined correction of Aueratus and Elmsley, would be extremely probable, if the doctrine that the optative mood, except in the sense of a wish, cannot dispense with ἄν were still to be maintained: as the question now stands, it must be looked upon as an unnecessary though ingenious change. Independently of the absence of ἄν, the words πημονὴν ἀρκύστατον have been questioned; but even those who hold that ἀρκύστατον cannot be used as an adjective, in spite of the probability furnished by the plural τὰ ἀρκύστατα, and the authority of Eurip. Orest. 1422, ἐς ἀρκυστάταν μηχανὰν ἐμπλέκειν, which Blomfield appears to have no warrant for questioning, must admit that it may very

well be understood as a substantive in apposition, especially as it seems to be closely connected with φράσσειν, the sense of which it will thus modify and define. A similar power in the case of *adjectives* has been noticed already more than once, especially on v. 517; and in both cases it may fairly be called an *adverbial* use of the noun, the position of the word generally showing that its sense is to be combined with that of the verb. In English we may frequently render it by an adverb, as here "to hedge up vengeance *net-wise*." Our idiom will also admit of our translating it, "to hedge up vengeance *into* a net," i. e. to make it into a net by hedging, as if it were ποιεῖν or τιθέναι τῷ φράσσειν, from which we see that it is an instance of what some grammarians (e. g. Becker in his German Grammar) call the Factitive Object, "that which expresses the effect exerted by the predicate either upon the suffering object or upon the subject itself." ὕψος is perhaps to be taken in the same way, as Paley has observed in his brief note, "φράσσειν ὕψος ut διδάσκειν τινα σοφὸν, et similia:" at any rate it must be regarded as in apposition with πημ. or ἀρκ., not as Klausen thinks, construed after κρείσσον, "majus altitudine."

\* Perhaps it would have been better to have simply referred to the view of the whole subject of the accusative after the verb given in Jelf's Greek Grammar.



ἔμοι δ' ἀγὼν ὅδ' οὐκ ἀφρόντιστος πάλαι  
 νείκης παλαιᾶς ἦλθε, σὺν χρόνῳ γε μήν. 1345  
 ἔστηκα δ' ἔνθ' ἔπαισ' ἐπ' ἐξειργασμένοις.  
 οὔτω δ' ἔπραξα, καὶ τάδ' οὐκ ἀρνήσομαι,  
 ὥς μήτε φεύγειν μήτ' ἀμύνεσθαι μόρον.  
 ἄπειρον ἀμφίβληστρον, ὥσπερ ἰχθύων,  
 περιστιχίζω, πλοῦτον εἵματος κακόν. 1350  
 παίω δέ νιν δῖς· κὰν δυοῖν οἰμώγμασιν  
 μεθῆκεν αὐτοῦ κῶλα· καὶ πεπτωκότι  
 τρίτην ἐπενδίδωμι, τοῦ κατὰ χθονὸς  
 Αἴδου, νεκρῶν σωτήρος, εὐκταίαν χάριν.  
 οὔτω τὸν αὐτοῦ θυμὸν ὀρμαίνει πεσών· 1355  
 κακφυσιῶν ὀξείαν αἵματος σφαγὴν  
 βάλλει μ' ἐρεμνῇ ψακάδι φοινίας δρόσου,  
 χαίρουσαν οὐδὲν ἦσσον, ἧ διοσδότῳ  
 γάνει σπορητὸς, κάλυκος ἐν λοχεύμασιν.  
 ὥς ὧδ' ἐχόντων, πρέσβος Ἀργείων τόδε, 1360  
 χαίροιτ' ἂν, εἰ χαίροιτ', ἐγὼ δ' ἐπεύχομαι.

1345. ἀγὼν is not to be taken here simply in the sense of a contest, as all the editors seem to have thought, but in that of a *crisis*, the *moment* of the struggle. The νείκη, (Heath's correction for νίκης) had long been burning: the *point* of the contest, though long expected, had only just arrived, and was already past. Paley retains the old reading, νίκης, on which he makes οὐκ ἀφρόντιστος depend, "not irrespective of a former victory," i.e. as he explains it, "quo pervicit Agamemno ut Iphigenia mactaretur:" but this is very harsh.

1348. ἀμύνασθαι is certainly superior in MSS. authority to ἀμύνεσθαι, the common reading: and as such Klausen, Haupt, and Peile may be right in restoring it: but the argument of the two former, founded on its intrinsic propriety, because in

escape the action is continuing, in *self-defence* complete, will not bear much examination. Klausen says, "propulsatio erat simplex actio, ereptio securis et ictus Clytæmnestræ inflictus:" but is it not manifest, that had there been any object in reversing the two, and reading φυγεῖν and ἀμύνεσθαι, he might have contended with equal justice that Agamemnon might possibly have escaped at once by running out of the chamber, while to ward off the blows or wrest the axe from Clytæmnestra would be more likely to be a work of time? On the whole, I think it more probable, that the MSS., which in a matter like this are no very trustworthy guides, should be mistaken, than that the poet should intentionally have varied the tense; and accordingly I have replaced the old read-

Not unforeseen it came on me, though late,  
 This struggle-moment of an ancient feud.  
 Here stand I where I smote now all is o'er!—  
 I planned it so, and I will not deny it,  
 That he could neither fly nor ward the blow—  
 A net without an end, as 'twere for fish,  
 Round him I fix—a fatal wealth of clothing.  
 I strike him twice: two groans he gave, and then  
 His limbs sank under him: and as he lay  
 I gift him with a third, a votive boon  
 To Dis, the dead man's saviour, under earth.  
 So his own soul he works up as he lies:  
 And, breathing out the quick sharp rush of blood,  
 With the black drop of gory dew he strikes me,  
 Rejoicing no whit less than the sown land  
 In Jove's rich blessing when the cup brings forth.  
 This being so, ye Argive elders here,  
 Joy, if ye be for joy: but I'm for boasting.

ing, which Paley also retains.

1350. Blomfield supposes *πλούτον* *εἵματος* to imply that the garment was dyed with purple, and compares v. 918: but this is gratuitous, and it is better to understand the words with Klausen, as referring only to its length or abundance, like *ἄπειρον* in the line before, just as *γᾶς* *πλούτος* *ἄβυσσος* is used in Sept. 949.

1352. *μεθῆκεν αὐτοῦ κῶλα*, *solvit ibi genua*, Butler apud Peile—a construction which avoids the necessity of reading *αὐτοῦ* with Wellauer and Paley, after Voss. Nor is it absolutely necessary to supply *πληγὴν* after *τρίτην*, as that word may have been meant to agree with *χάριν*. “Acerba ironia cum Orcum dicat mortuorum servatorum ut Jovem inferum, quia vivorum servator est Jupiter superus, v. 222 (235), tertium ictum huic servatori devovet, sicut tertia libatio Jovi servatori sacra habetur.” Klausen.

1355. *δρμαίνει* seems here to ex-

press the physical tumult attending a violent death, the catching of breath and the gurgle of blood, Virgil's *sanguine singultantem*, whence it is transferred elsewhere to its more usual sense of mental emotion: *θυμὸν* has nothing to do with *mind* or *passion* as such, but means the physical soul or spirit, *anima* rather than *animus*.

1358. Porson's *διοσδότῳ γάνει* (for *Διὸς νότῳ γᾶν εἰ*) is one of those emendations which rank among the highest triumphs of critical sagacity, and need no advocacy to support them. Hermann and Klausen have in vain attempted by making use of part of it to strike out something better, the one reading *Διὸς νότῳ γανᾶ*, the other *Διὸς νότῳ γάνει*, both assuming that *νότος* can be used convertibly with *νότις*, which can hardly be admitted, even if we allow that *νότος*, as in Soph. Phil. 1457, means properly a rainy wind.



εἰ δ' ἦν πρεπόντως ὥστ' ἐπισπένδειν νεκρῷ,  
τάδ' ἂν δικαίως ἦν· ὑπερδίκως μὲν οὖν  
τοσῶνδε κρατῆρ' ἐν δόμοις κακῶν ὅδε  
πλήσας ἀραίῳν, αὐτὸς ἐκπίνει μολῶν.

1365

ΧΟ. θαυμάζομέν σου γλῶσσαν ὥς θρασύστομος,  
ἥτις τοιόνδ' ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ κομπάζεις λόγον.

ΚΛ. πειρᾶσθέ μου γυναικὸς ὥς ἀφράσμονος·  
ἐγὼ δ' ἀτρέστῳ καρδίᾳ πρὸς εἰδότας  
λέγω· σὺ δ' αἰνεῖν εἴτε με ψέγειν θέλεις,  
ὅμοιον· οὗτός ἐστιν Ἀγαμέμνων, ἐμὸς  
πόσις, νεκρὸς δὲ τῆσδε δεξιᾶς χερὸς,  
ἔργον δικαίας τέκτονος. τάδ' ὦδ' ἔχει.

1370

ΧΟ.                                    τί κακὸν, ὦ γύναι,                                    στροφή.  
   χθονοτρεφὲς ἑδανόν, ἢ ποτὸν                                    1375  
   πασαμένα, ῥυτᾶς ἐξ ἁλὸς ὀρόμενον,  
   τόδ' ἐπέθου θύος δημοθρόους τ' ἀράς;

1362. *πρεπόντως*, the correction of Voss and Stanley, seems nearly certain, confirmed as it is by *δικαίως* immediately following. In a case like this it is not enough to prove that *πρεπόντων* might possibly have been used, which may be conceded to Peile; it must be shown that the probability of its having been employed here by Æschylus is greater than that of its having been introduced by a simple error of the copyists: and in this case the difficulty of the old reading, the propriety of the new, and the extremely slight transition between them furnish altogether as strong an argument as is generally to be found for making a correction, though not so immediately convincing as that which met us just now in the preceding note. Adopting it, we need not however put a full stop after *μὲν οὖν* in order to make the construction of the three adverbs the same: as we may with

equal propriety translate, "Yea, if it were fitly done to pour libations over a dead body, this would have here been justly done: with exceeding justice, rather should I say it is, that he here having filled in his home a cup with so many accursed evils, himself return to drink it off." *Μὲν οὖν* here, as elsewhere, makes a correction of the thought on the part of the speaker: she does not however apply the adverb thus strengthened to the hypothetical pouring out of the libation, but rather sets before her the cup which Agamemnon has actually drunk, by a natural connection of thought, and declares the draining of that cup to be a matter of exceeding justice. But there is no objection against the full stop after *μὲν οὖν*, which Tyrwhitt and Hermann recommend, and Wellauer, Dindorf, and Paley follow. By this punctuation we get a strict balancing of the

Nay, if libations on the dead were meet,  
'Twould be done justly—with exceeding justice,  
He having in the house so filled with curses  
A cup, arrives himself and drinks it off.

CHO. We wonder at thy tongue, how bold thou art,  
Who boastest in such language o'er thy lord.

CLY. Ye try me like an unconsidering woman;  
But I with fearless heart to you that know  
Speak out: and whether thou wilt praise or blame  
'Tis all as one. He there is Agamemnon,  
My husband—made a corpse by this right hand,  
The work of a true workman. There thou hast it.

CHO. Woman, what poison of earth or of water  
Eaten or drunk bade thee plunge in this slaughter  
Loading thy head with a realm's execration,

thoughts, and a rhetorical heightening of the emphasis, objected to indeed by Peile as more after the manner of Euripides than of Æschylus, but quite in accordance with the studied and triumphant composure which Clytæmnestra elsewhere exhibits; while the other gives us a further specimen of that rapid transition from thought to thought which appears in the beginning of the speech, and would be equally characteristic of her here.

1366. There is little to choose between pointing after γλῶσσαν, with Wellauer, Dindorf, and Klausen, and after σου with Peile. If we adopt the former, we must suppose θρασύστομος to agree with συ, on account of ἥτις which follows, as there is no authority for reading κομπάζει.

1369. It is more simple to connect πρὸς εἰδότας in the ordinary sense with λέγω, than with Peile to connect it with ἀτρέστῳ καρδίᾳ, and suppose “a peculiar use of the preposition πρὸς,” in the sense of contrast or strong opposition, though

there is no doubt that it might have such a force here, and probably has in other passages, such as those which he quotes.

1372. νεκρὸς, as Peile remarks, is to be taken with τῆσδε δεξιᾶς χερὸς, ἔργον δικαίας τέκτονος being evidently meant as an epexegetis. Paley would understand ἔργον as an accusative, like ἀρωγὰν v. 216; but this is unnecessary in a case like this, where only a common apposition is required, and the passages are not exactly parallel, as ἔργον here is equivalent to and identical with νεκρὸς, whereas ἀρωγὰν there, like ἀπολαυσιν in Eur. Hel. 77, is something following on and consequently separable from the notion expressed by the rest of the sentence to which it belongs.

1377. θύος has been variously interpreted, “de statu animi Clytæmnestræ,” says Klausen: “hoc furiale facinus.” Haupt: it seems however plain that it is to be understood in the ordinary sense of incense, (of the use of which with ἐπιθέσθαι or ἐπι-



Casting off, cutting off?—Driven off from thy nation  
The hate of the land thou shalt know!

CLY. Now thou art dooming me to banishment,  
To the land's hate and public execration;  
Thou, who had'st no such threats for this man here,  
When he, not caring, as it had been a beast,  
Though sheep were plenty in his fleecy folds,  
Slew his own daughter, dearest of my pangs  
To me, a charm to soothe the winds of Thrace.  
Him shouldst not thou have banished from the land  
For his foul deed? but now set up to judge  
My acts, thou art all sternness. But I tell thee  
To threaten in the faith that I am prepared  
On equal terms, for thee, if thou should'st conquer,  
To rule: but should the contrary be willed,  
Teaching, though late, shall give thee sober sense.

CHO. High is thy courage, and haughty thy braving,

eum qui vicerit mihi imperare:" Haupt, "Dico tibi autem te minari hoc ut comparatæ mihi tu similiter, victoria reportata, imperes." Paley comes nearer to what seems the better and more natural interpretation, giving as the construction, λέγω σοι τοιαῦτ' ἀπειλεῖν, ὡς παρεσκευασμένης ἐμοῦ ἐκ τῶν ὁμοίων ἀπειλεῖν, χειρὶ κ. τ. λ., though I do not see the necessity of understanding ἀπειλεῖν after ἐκ τῶν ὁμοίων, which words refer not to any threats which Clytæmnestra is prepared to utter, but to the terms to which she is ready to submit, those namely which follow, that the conqueror is to command the conquered.

1396. ὥσπερ οὖν is to be taken with the whole clause, not, as Klausen and Peile think, only with φονολιβεῖ τύχα. The sense of the whole is well given by Paley, "Magna meditæris et superba loqueris, sicut

animus cæde delirat, i. e. ut cujus animus cædis conscientia percussus sit." So in English we might say, "Thy words breathe haughtiness, even as thy soul is raving," meaning that the tone of the words is in exact correspondence with what would be expected from the raving. There can be no occasion to read λίβος in the next line with Casaubon, Blomfield, and Dindorf, as the copyists with φονολιβεῖ τύχα before them would hardly have introduced another word had that been in the original text, and λίπος is amply supported by Soph. Ant. 1022. εὐπρέπει is rightly given from the Farnese MS. and Turnebus by Klausen, Peile, and Paley, the former of whom compares εὐπρεπτος, in place of the old corrupt reading εὐπρέπειαν, for which Canter would substitute ἐμπρέπει, Hermann ἐμπρέπειν.

φονολιβεῖ τύχα φρὴν ἐπιμαίνεται.  
 λίπος ἐπ' ὀμμάτων αἵματος εὖ πρέπει  
 ἀτίετον· ἔτι σε χοῇ  
 στερομέναν φίλων  
 τύμμα τύμματι τίσαι.

1400

ΚΛ. καὶ τήνδ' ἀκούεις ὀρκίων ἐμῶν θέμιν·  
 μὰ τὴν τέλειον τῆς ἐμῆς παιδὸς Δίκην,  
 Ἄτην, Ἐρινύν θ', αἴσι τόνδ' ἔσφαξ' ἐγὼ,  
 οὗ μοι φόβου μέλαθρον ἐλπίς ἐμπατεῖν,  
 ἕως ἂν αἴθῃ πῦρ ἐφ' ἐστίας ἐμῆς  
 Αἴγισθος, ὥς τὸ πρόσθεν εὖ φρονῶν ἐμοί.  
 οὗτος γὰρ ἡμῖν ἀσπίς οὐ μικρὰ θράσους.  
 κεῖται γυναικὸς τῆσδε λυμαντήριος,  
 Χρυσηΐδων μείλιγμα τῶν ὑπ' Ἰλίου·  
 ἧ τ' αἰχμάλωτος ἦδε καὶ τερασκόπος,  
 καὶ κοινόλεκτρος τοῦδε, θεσφατηλόγος  
 πιστὴ ξύνευνος, ναυτίλων δὲ σελμάτων  
 ἱστοτρίβης. ἄτιμα δ' οὐκ ἐπραξάτην·  
 ὁ μὲν γὰρ οὕτως· ἡ δέ τοι, κύκνου δίκην,  
 τὸν ὕστατον μέλψασα θανάσιμον γόον,  
 κεῖται φιλήτωρ τοῦδ', ἐμοὶ δ' ἐπήγαγεν  
 εὐνῆς παροψώνημα τῆς ἐμῆς χλιδῆς.

1405

1410

1415

1405. φόβου μέλαθρον ἐμπατεῖν is a bold expression, which it is equally needless to destroy by reading φόβω, and to convert into a frigid prosopopœia of Hope walking in the house of Fear, by following, as Dindorf and Franz have done, the text of the Flor. and Farn. MSS. ἐμπατεῖ. It is qualified, as Peile justly observes, by the connection in which it stands, the sense in fact being, "With Ægisthus for its master, I do not expect *my* house to be a house of Fear," so that Æschy-

lus cannot be charged with using "walking in the house of Fear" as an elaborate synonyme for being afraid. On the next line Klausen has remarked, "Sacra in ædibus fiunt a domino: itaque his verbis futurum dominum ædium Ægisthum designat regina."

1413. σελμάτων ἱστοτρίβης is equivalent to τρίβουσα ἵστον καὶ σέλματα, "well-known about the mast and the seaman's benches," as Peile gives it, in the same way as ἀπεπλος φαρέων λεύκων stands for ἄμοιρος πέπλων καὶ

E'en as in bloodshed thy spirit is raving  
 With a drop of fresh gore glaring red on thy forehead  
 Unavenged!—it will come, when forlorn and abhorred  
 Thou wilt render a blow for a blow!—

CLY. And now thou hearest my set form of oath :  
 No—by the perfect vengeance of my child,  
 By Ate and Erinnys, at whose shrine  
 I have slain this man,—no hope have I to walk  
 In the house of Fear, while yet Ægisthus burns  
 Fire on my hearth, still kind to me as ever :  
 For he's no trifling shield of boldness to me.—  
 There lies the fell destroyer of this woman,  
 Minion of each Chryseis under Troy ;  
 And she his captive here and wonder-gazer,  
 Aye, and his bedfellow, soothsayer at once  
 And concubine, who shared with him the bench  
 On shipboard. No—they have not wrought unpaid.  
 For he is thus : and she there, like a swan,  
 So having sung her last, her dying strain,  
 Lies there, his paramour, and hath brought to me  
 A nuptial dainty-dish of new delight.

φαρέων, and ἄχαλκος ἀσπίδων for ἀνευ χαλκείων ἀσπίδων.

1417. “*εὐνῆς παροψώνημα*, additamentum adulterii, unam notionem efficit, unde pendeat τῆς ἐμῆς χλιδῆς.” It is strange that Paley, after shewing by the words just quoted how perfectly he understood the construction of this line, should go on to say that he believes *χλιδῆ*, a conjecture of Musgrave and Blomfield's, to be the true reading. Wellauer, Klausen, and Peile, find no difficulty in the double genitive, but misinterpret the word *εὐνῆς*, which cannot possibly mean here “by her lying in the grave,” whatever may be the

case in Cho. 318, Soph. Elect. 436, where the context plainly shews that the tomb is meant, *εὐνῆς παροψώνημα* is put for *εὐναῖον παρ.*, “a nuptial dainty dish :” and in *παροψώνημα χλιδῆς* the preposition exerts its force of addition. The additional zest given to Clytæmnestra's pleasure by the fate of Cassandra lies in the feeling that by her commerce with Ægisthus and murder of her victims she has not only avenged her daughter but repaid her husband's infidelities: and though this was not the motive cause of her adultery in the first instance, yet it adds poignancy to the continued enjoyment.

## ΚΟΜΜΑΤΙΚΑ.

- ΗΜ. Α'. φεῦ, τίς ἂν ἐν τάχει, μὴ περιώδυνος, στρ. α'.  
 μηδὲ δεμνιοτήρης, 1420  
 μόλοι τὸν αἰεὶ φέρουσ' ἐν ἡμῖν  
 μοῖρ' ἀτέλευτον ὕπνον, δαμέντος  
 φύλακος εὐμενεστάτου,  
 καὶ πολλὰ τλαντὸς γυναικὸς δίαί;  
 πρὸς γυναικὸς δ' ἀπέφθισεν βίον. 1425
- ΧΟ. ἰὼ, ἰὼ παράνους Ἑλένα, συστ. α'.  
 μία τὰς πολλὰς, τὰς πάνυ πολλὰς  
 ψυχὰς ὀλέσας ὑπὸ Τροίᾳ.
- ΗΜ. Β'. νῦν δὲ τελείαν στρ. β'.  
 πολύμναστον ἀπηνθίσω 1430  
 δι' αἶμ' ἄνιπτον, ἧτις ἦν τότε ἐν δόμοις  
 ἔρις ἐρίδματος, ἀνδρὸς οἰζύς.
- ΚΛ. μηδὲν θανάτου μοῖραν ἐπεύχου, σύστ. β'.  
 τοῖσδε βαρυνθείς.

1419. I have followed Peile in adopting the distribution of this lyrical dialogue, which was originally proposed by Butler, and has been accepted with modifications by Blomfield, Scholefield, and Dindorf, in opposition to that which the other German editors have introduced. In the anapæsts, as Paley and Klausen remark, there is no need to suppose the existence of *lacunæ*, as all that is there required is that system should answer to system in its general features, not in the precise number of its syllables or lines. With regard to other deficiencies it is natural to suppose that the antistrophe to vv. 1426 sqq. must be sought for after v. 1445 rather than in vv. 1509 sqq., even if the former passage were left evidently defective, and the latter more conformable to the supposed

requirements of the metre than is actually the case. Paley objects that vv. 1429—1432 must be either utterly corrupt or out of their proper place, as they interrupt Clytæmnestra's answer; but they only require proper explanation in order to harmonize with it perfectly.

1420. *δεμνιοτήρης* I have rendered "forcing the couch to keep:" but it is not improbable that the words *περιώδυνος* and *δεμνιοτήρης* are applied to the disease itself, which is supposed to suffer in the same way as the patient.

1421. *ἐν ἡμῖν* must not be taken with *ἀτέλευτον*, as Klausen and Paley think, but with *φέρουσα*, which has thus the force of *φέρουσα εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ τρεθείσα ἐν ἡμῖν*, a combination which it is needless to illustrate by examples.

1424. The editors have not ex-



CHO. Oh! that some Fate, not fraught with pain,  
 Nor forcing the couch to keep,  
 Would come and bring to my tortured brain  
 The rest of unending sleep,  
 Now that he, our kindest friend, lies low;—  
 For a woman he bore long years of woe,  
 And now he is dead by a woman's blow!—  
 O Helen! Helen! whose frantic will  
 Those countless, countless lives could kill  
 Alone at the walls of Ilion!  
 But now thou a mighty life hast slain,  
 A full-famed life, for the uncleansed blood,  
 The strife which erewhile in the palace stood  
 Built high to heaven, a husband's bane!

CLY. Nay, pray not thus from thy sorrow's weight  
 For the stroke of fate,

plained whether *τλάντος* is to be coupled as a participle with *δαμέντος*, or in an adjectival sense with *εὐμεσεστάτου*. The latter is the more probable; the force of the past tense being equivalent in English to "after having endured," or "who had endured many things."

1429. It is a matter of doubt whether we ought to adopt Casaubon's correction *ἀπηνθίσω*, with most of the subsequent editors, rendering, "But now thou hast cut off a complete and noble life" (*ψυχὴν* being understood from *ψύχας*) "all owing to the uncleansed blood," &c., or, retaining the common reading *ἐπηνθίσω*, refer *τελείαν* to *ἔρις* and *οἰζὺς* in v. 1432, and translate, "But now thou hast brought to full and memorable perfection ..... that which was already planted in the family," &c. The first is followed in the translation: but the second is equally good, and besides involves no change in the text. In either case there is no necessity for supposing

the passage to be corrupt; the Chorus is speaking of the consummation of Helen's fatal influence, wrought out in the death of Agamemnon, *owing* to the blood yet uncleansed (that of Iphigenia, though probably with a reference to the children of Thyestes, both here and in the words that follow, since the two facts in some measure correspond to each other, the death of Agamemnon's daughter being both in itself and in its consequence a retribution to the descendants of Atreus for the crime of their progenitor): and Clytæmnestra's answer refers to these words of the Semi-Chorus, no less than to those which precede them, as she says, "Turn not thy wrath against Helen, as though she, *having* singly destroyed the lives of many of the Danaans, caused *this* unclosing wound," where *ὀλέσας* corresponds to *ὀλέσας* in v. 1428, and *ἀξύστατον ἄλγος* to the passage now before us.

1432. *ἔρις ἐρίδματος*, which Paley



μηδ' εἰς Ἑλένην κότον ἐκτρέψης, 1435  
 ὥς ἀνδrolέτειρ', ὥς μία πολλῶν  
 ἀνδρῶν ψυχὰς Δαναῶν ὀλέσας,  
 ἀξύστατον ἄλγος ἔπραξεν.

ΗΜ. Α'. δαῖμον, ὃς ἐμπίτνεις δώμασι καὶ διφυ- ἀντ. α'.  
 εἰσι Τανταλίδαισιν, 1440  
 κράτος τ' ἰσόψυχον ἐκ γυναικῶν  
 καρδιόδηκτον ἐμοὶ κρατύνεις.  
 ἐπὶ δὲ σώματος, δίκαν  
 μοὶ κόρακος ἐχθροῦ, σταθεὶς ἐκνόμως  
 ὕμνον ὕμνῃν ἐπεύχεται \* \* 1445

ΧΟ. \* \* \* \* ἀντισύστ. α'.  
 \* \* \* \* \*  
 \* \* \* \*

ΗΜ. Β'. \* \* \* ἀντιστρ. β'.  
 \* \*  
 \* \* \* \* \*  
 \* \* \*

ΚΛ. νῦν δ' ὄρθωσας στόματος γνώμην, ἀντισύστ. β'.  
 τὸν τριπάχχιον  
 δαίμονα γέννας τῆσδε κικλήσκων·  
 ἐκ τοῦ γὰρ ἔρως αἱματόλοιχος  
 νεῖρῃ τρέφεται· πρὶν καταλήξαι 1450

is inclined to give up, appears to mean "strife strongly built," as Symmons explains it, according to the analogy of εὔμητος and the Homeric compounds of ἐρι-, not derived, as Peile supposes, from ἔρις, though the similarity of sound was probably intentional. ἀνδρὸς οἰζὺς, like ἀνδρὸς σφαγεῖον in v. 1056, though there the stress is mainly laid on a man as distinguished from a beast, here as distinguished from a woman.

1438. Blomfield, Haupt, and

Peile, render ἀξύστατος *incompositus*: Klausen and Paley *incomparabilis*: but I prefer understanding it, in Horace's words, "qui nequidquam coit et rescinditur." Schutz came near this sense when he wrote "dorem qui haud facile sisti potest insanabile malum," but it does not seem clear from his words that he caught the exact force of the metaphor.

1441. Klausen, Peile, and Paley, with some variations, agree in the sense of Butler's translation, "par

Nor turn upon Helen thy vengeful hate  
For that she, fell pest, having singly slain  
Unnumbered souls of the Danaan train  
Hath wrought such unhealing trouble.

CHO. Demon, who on this home dost light  
And the brother Tantalids,  
And steelest the will's heart-piercing might  
In the breast of frenzied brides!  
There on the body it stands amain  
Like a hateful raven, and now would fain  
Pour forth in its pride a tuneless strain!

CLY. Aye, now thou hast mended thy speech's frame,  
Calling out for blame  
The thrice-great fiend of this race by name.  
'Tis from him this thirst of blood is reared;  
And now ere the old have disappeared

robur jam per feminas, quo mihi cor angitur, exerces." Haupt's view of the passage is better, "vehementiam consentientem mulierum animum meum pungentem excitas." *κράτος* is the power and will for mischief, *ισόψυχον* of equal soul, or prevailing equally in the two souls, (as if it had been *ἴσον κράτος ψυχῆς*), *ἐκ γυναικῶν*, coming from or wielded by women. *ἐμοὶ* is not constructed with *καρδιόδηκτον*, but is a pleonastic dative, "for me," or "to my sorrow." The sense of what follows in v. 1443, &c. cannot be precisely ascertained on account of the lacuna, so that it is difficult to say whether or no Schutz is right in reading *σταθεῖσ'*. Paley says that if we admit a lacuna we must suppose Clytæmnestra's reply to be interrupted; but an objection equally incapable of proof or disproof, as we can tell nothing about the sense of the lost lines, which are just as likely to have carried on the thought here begun, perhaps to have given

additional point to the answer, as to have introduced any thing worthy of the name of an interruption. In v. 1444 *ἐκνόμως* is *discordantly*, as Peile explains it.

1447. "*τριπάχυν* quid significat prorsus incertum est: an recte *πάχυνος* a *παχὺς* procedere possit, non dixerim. Vertendum videtur *prægravem*." Paley. Such a sense is confirmed by *ἐμπίτνεις* v. 1439, and *μέγαν ... καὶ βαρύμηνιν* v. 1452. The conjectures that have been proposed are *τρίσπαχυν* Pauw and Butler, *τριπάλαιον* Blomfield, adopted by Klausen, *τριπαλαίστην* or *τριπάχυντον* Bamberger, *τρίπλαχ' υἷον* Haupt.

1450. *νείρα* is Wellauer's adaptation of Casaubon's *νείρη* (instead of *νείρει*, a vox nihili). Peile defends the Ionic or Epic form, as natural in the case of a purely Epic word: but the probability of Æschylus having introduced an Ionic form into a Doric system, contrary to what we know of the usages of Greek tragedy, even in the case of

τὸ παλαιὸν ἄχος, νέος ἵχωρ.

ΗΜ. Α'. ἦ μέγαν οἴκοις τοῖσδε στρ. γ'.  
 δαίμονα καὶ βαρύμηνιν αἰνεῖς,  
 φεῦ, φεῦ, κακὸν αἶνον ἀτη-  
 ρᾶς τύχας ἀκορέστου. 1455  
 ἰὼ ἰῆ, διαὶ Διὸς .  
 παναιτίου, πανεργέτα·  
 τί γὰρ βροτοῖς ἄνευ Διὸς τελεῖται ;  
 τί τῶνδ' οὐ θεόκραντὸν ἐστίν ;

ΧΟ. ἰὼ ἰὼ, βασιλεῦ βασιλεῦ, σύστ. γ'.  
 πῶς σε δακρύσω ; 1461  
 φρενὸς ἐκ φιλίας τί ποτ' εἶπω ;  
 κεῖσαι δ' ἀράχνης ἐν ὑφάσματι τῷδ'  
 ἄσεβεῖ θανάτῳ βίον ἐκπνέων.

ΗΜ. Β'. ὦμοι μοι κοίταν τάνδ' ἀνελεύθερον, στρ. δ'.  
 δολίῳ μόρῳ δαμεῖς 1466  
 ἐκ χερὸς ἀμφιτόμῳ βελέμνῳ.

ΚΛ. αὐχεῖς εἶναι τόδε τοῦργον ἐμόν. σύστ. δ'.  
 μὴ δ' ἐπιλεχθῆς

so-called Homeric words, can scarcely be weighed against that of a transcriber having confused NEIPAI and NEIPEI.

1454. It does not much signify whether we retain the colon after αἰνεῖς, or with the late editors remove it, so as to make κακὸν αἶνον a separate accusative. If we adopt the latter we may proceed further and take away the full stop after ἀκορέστου, as ἰὼ, ἰῆ may be interjectional as well as φεῦ, φεῦ.

1465. The later editors connect this strophe closely with the preceding, in order to construe κοίταν with κεῖσαι. It seems however more natural to consider it as an exclama-

tion, supposing the construction to be broken and interrupted, ὦ μοι μοι κοίταν τάνδ' ἀνελεύθερον——.δολίῳ μόρῳ δαμεῖς, words which will then be put for ὦ μοι κοίταν ἣν ἔχεις δαμεῖς, like ὦμοι θάκουσ οὗς θάσσω in Euríp. Troad. 138, where the language is more regular, as the speaker is not so overcome by her feelings. It is possible too that κοίταν may be governed by δαμεῖς, as a cognate accusative. ἐκ χερὸς must be connected with δαμεῖς, as in Soph. Aj. 26. κατηναρισμένας Ἐκ χειρὸς, ἀμφιτόμῳ βελέμνῳ being added to specify the instrument.—The κοίτα here spoken of is the δροίτας χαμεύνα of v. 1511. It is called ἀνελεύθερος, as we speak

The new drops are seen to bubble !

CHO. Oh ! great and of tyrant will  
 Is the demon thou nam'st to the royal palace !  
 Woe ! woe ! for the accursed ill,  
 For the Ate-plague of his unstayed malice !  
 Alas ! from Zeus it came,  
 The doer and the cause of all !  
 For what on mortals save from Zeus can fall ?  
 What here, but bears a heavenly author's name ?  
 Oh ! how shall I wail thee, my king, my king ?  
 How utter my passionate grieving,  
 As thou liest, sobbing out thy life's warm spring  
 In this net of the spider's weaving ?  
 O woe ! for thy reclining on this base, base bed,  
 By foul craft sped  
 With the two-edged weapon's cleaving !

CLY. So thou boastest of this as a deed of mine !  
 But no thought be thine

of a foul or base murder, referring partly to the sufferer, who is dealt with as none but a wretch unfit to live should be dealt with, partly to the doer, who has committed a disgraceful and damning act. The deed is regarded as one belonging to a different state of society—a state where no good exists, and wretches are at war with wretches. Such *ἀνελευθερία* is especially indicated by a murder where craft is combined with violence, a *δόλιος μῦθος*. Clytæmnestra in reply (v. 1492), says that the death of her husband cannot be called *ἀνελεύθερος*, so far as he is concerned—a fate unworthy of him as an *εὐλεύθερος*—and consequently, not disgraceful to her, as the perpetrator. A crafty murder, considered with reference to the true order of things, is *ἀνελεύθερος*, even when done on a crafty murderer : but as regards him, there is a fairness and justice about it. Ac-

ording to the standard of *ἐλευθερία*, which he has introduced, it is in fact *ἐλευθέριος* : nor is the avenger stained by the act, as though wrong in itself, it is made right by the previous wrong which it recompenses. Thus Agamemnon, having himself introduced a *δολία ἄτα*, suffered a death which would have been *ἀνελεύθερος* for another man, but was not so for him, as he had no real *ἐλευθερία*, and with the rule of *ἐλευθερία* which he had adopted it was perfectly consistent. This explanation of the several passages will enable us to see that there is no occasion to alter the text in any way, whether it be proposed to read *δολίῳ* for *δολίῳ* here and in v. 1490, and *δούλιον* for *δολίαν* in v. 1494 with Dobree, Blomfield, and Paley, or to bracket vv. 1492, 3 as spurious, with Dindorf and Peile, after Seidler.

1469. “ μὴ δ' ἐπιλεχθῆς we may

Ἄγαμεμνονίαν εἶναί μ' ἄλοχον.  
 φανταζόμενος δὲ γυναικὶ νεκροῦ  
 τοῦδ', ὁ παλαιὸς δριμύς ἀλάστωρ  
 Ἀτρέως, χαλεποῦ θοινατῆρος,  
 τόνδ' ἀπέτισεν,  
 τέλεον νεαροῖς ἐπιθύσας.

1470

1475

HM. Α'. ὥς μὲν ἀναίτιος εἶ σὺ  
 τοῦδε φόνου, τίς ὁ μαρτυρήσων ;  
 πῶ ; πῶ ; πατρόθεν δὲ συλλή-  
 πτωρ γένοιτ' ἂν ἀλάστωρ.  
 βιάζεται δ' ὁμοσπόροις  
 ἐπιρροαῖσιν αἱμάτων  
 μέλας Ἀρης·† ὅποι δὲ καὶ προβαίνων  
 πάχνα κουροβόρῳ παρέξει.

ἀντιστρ. γ'.

1480

translate, *but say not that I, &c.*, the primary meaning of this deponent verb being, *do not make your reckoning or account*, do not set it down that, &c.: see Buttmann's *Lexilogus* art. 76. §. 7. Hesych., Ἐπιλεγόμενος· ἐπιλογιζόμενος. Ἐπιλεξάμενος· διαλεγείς, ἐνθυμηθεὶς: and Suidas, Ἐπιλεξάμενος· ἀναμετρήσας, ἀναλογισάμενος." Peile.

1474. The commentators in general have not explained this use of ἀπέτισεν, though no one seems to have doubted as to the sense of the passage. Peile says, "τόνδ' ἀπέτισεν, *has retaliated upon this man*, i. e. *has made his life the satisfaction for the lives which Atreus took away*:" from which he does not appear to have seen that what he has given as the explanation is probably the literal version, "has paid this man as a compensation," or "has made satisfaction in his person."

1478. πῶ ; πῶ ; The authority of these words has been questioned by Peile, and denied by Dindorf, who with Butler and Blomfield reads

πῶς ; πῶς ; from the margin of Askew's copy. This correction I have followed in the translation, simply because it was necessary to insert two words having some meaning: but though we do not know the meaning of πῶ ; πῶ ; we cannot say that Æschylus may not have so written. πῶ is the interrogative of πω, as πότε of ποτε, ποῦ of που, πόθεν of ποθεν; all of them are evidently inflections of ποσ; though how πω, consistently with its origin from an indefinite pronoun, comes to bear the sense of yet, it is difficult, if not impossible, to say. When we can explain the original force of πω, we shall be able to settle what would be its meaning when taken interrogatively: and only then can we hope to determine whether πῶ ; πῶ ; here is right or wrong.

1482. Here again we must suspend our judgment as to the sense of the passage, till the text has been placed in a better state. For my translation I have followed the rendering of Klausen and Peile, as

As though I were then Agamemnon's wife.  
 'Twas he, the Alastor, did late appear  
 In the guise of his queen, to the dead-man here :  
 The old stern fiend, in thirst for the blood  
 Of Atreus, who revelled in savage food,—  
*He took this life,*  
 On the young a grown man slaying !

CHO. Thou free ! that thou hadst no share  
 In this deed of death, who will bear thee witness ?  
 How ? how ?—but the race-fiend there  
 May have lent thee aid by the rule of fitness.  
 'Mid streams of kindred blood  
 Grim Mars is pressing on with force  
 Where fast advancing he must soon give course  
 To the clotted gore of children slain for food.

being at least as good as any that have been proposed, while it involves less departure from the common reading, *πάχνα* for *πάχνα*, from Hermann, being the only change : but I cannot persuade myself that *ὅποι δὲ καὶ* or *παρέξει* can have been written by Æschylus, at least if we are right in supposing the general meaning to turn on the vengeance exacted for the children of Thyestes. That debt was already paid by the death of Agamemnon : and the deeds of blood which were to happen afterwards, were to change the other scale of the balance. Nor is *παρέχειν* here likely to mean *copiam facere*, to give free course to, as in the other passages quoted as authorities for such a use the accusative to *παρέχειν* is either *ἑαυτον* or some other word to be supplied from the context, while here it is hard to say from what word such an object is to be gained. Apparently they would supply *ἑαυτον*, and translate “inserviet cruori effundendo :” but this is very

harsh. Pauw's interpretation, as it appears in Potter's English, “And points the ruthless boy to deeds of horror,” with the reading *πάχνα*, would be much better, at least in point of sense, but for the absurdity of supposing that *κουροβόρῳ* can mean *puero voraci*, i. e. Orestes. Schutz's “*frigus nativoro incutiet*” may seem plausible at first sight, confirmed as it is by the passage Symmons adduces from Xen. Œcon. 18. *πνιγμὸν παρέξει* : but *κουροβόρῳ* requires the article, and we are moreover placed in a dilemma, as Atreus was not a child-devourer, and Thyestes, to whom the word really applies, had not shown himself so hardhearted as to require extraordinary horrors to affect him. What lies hid in the words of the text I cannot pretend to say : possibly *ὅποι δὲ καὶ* may contain some inflection of *ὀπαδὸς* or *παιδικὸς* : but all this is at present mere guess work.

ΧΟ. ἰὼ ἰὼ, βασιλεῦ βασιλεῦ, ἀντισύστ. γ'.  
 πῶς σε δακρύσω; 1485

φρενὸς ἐκ φιλίας τί ποτ' εἶπω;  
 κείσαι δ' ἀράχνης ἐν ὑφάσματι τῷδ'  
 ἀσεβεῖ θανάτῳ βίον ἐκπνέων.

ΗΜ. Β'. ὦμοι μοι κοίταν τάνδ' ἀνελεύθερον, ἀντιστρ. δ'.  
 δολίῳ μὲν δαμείς 1490  
 ἐκ χερὸς ἀμφιτόμῳ βελέμνῳ.

ΚΛ. οὔτ' ἀνελεύθερον οἶμαι θάνατον ἀντισύστ. δ'.  
 τῷδε γενέσθαι.  
 οὐδὲ γὰρ οὗτος δολίαν ἄταν  
 οἴκοισιν ἔθηκ' ; 1495  
 ἀλλ' ἐμὸν ἐκ τοῦδ' ἔρνος ἀερθὲν,  
 τὴν πολύκλαυτόν τ' Ἰφιγενείαν,  
 ἄξια δράσας, ἄξια πάσχων,  
 μηδὲν ἐν Ἰδίου μεγαλαυχεῖτω,  
 ξιφοδηλήτῳ 1500  
 θανάτῳ τίσας ἅπερ ἤρξεν.

ΗΜ. Α'. ἀμνηχανῶ, φροντίδων στερηθεὶς, στρ. ε'.  
 εὐπάλαμον μέριμναν  
 ὅπα τράπωμαι, πίτνοντος οἴκου.  
 δέδοικα δ' ὄμβρου κτύπον δομοσφαλῇ 1505  
 τὸν αἵματηρόν· ψεκὰς δὲ λήγει.  
 δίκην δ' ἐπ' ἄλλο πρᾶγμα θηγάνει βλάβης

1492-4. See on v. 1465.

1497. "τὴν πολυκλαύτην Pors. sed  
 τε est *nempe*; ut Suppl. 675," Paley:  
 who would have done better to refer to  
 v. 1556 below, where see the note, or to  
 Suppl. 62, which Peile has adduced.  
 ἄξια δράσας ἄξια πάσχων, Hermann's  
 correction, is much more spirited than the  
 old reading ἀνάξια δράσας, and accords

well with οὔτ' ἀνελεύθερον v. 1492, as explained above.

1500. ξιφοδηλήτῳ here, like ξιφο-  
 δήλητος ἀγὼν in Choeph. 729, must be  
 taken actively, unless we suppose "a death  
 destroyed by the sword" to be put for "a  
 death of one destroyed by the sword."

1503. εὐπάλαμον μέριμναν may be  
 constructed after either ἀμνηχανῶ or

Oh ! how shall I wail thee, my king, my king ?  
 How utter my passionate grieving,  
 As thou liest sobbing out thy life's warm spring  
 In a net of the spider's weaving ?  
 O woe ! for thy reclining on this base, base bed,  
 By foul craft sped,  
 With the two-edged weapon's cleaving !

CLY. I cannot look on his death as base ;  
 What ? did not he in his own house place  
 The root of a crafty, foul disgrace ?  
 On her it was whose youthful bloom  
 He had made from my parent stem to grow,  
 Our Iphigenia, the child of woe,  
 He wrought things worthy the fate he found ;  
 Nor now let him glory under ground  
 By the sword's fell doom  
 The loss which he caused repaying.

CHO. Vaguely, vaguely, without power of thinking,  
 Grasp I at my mind,  
 How to wield it, now the house is sinking !  
 I fear, I fear the pattering shower of gore  
 That saps the mansion—for it drops no more !  
 And Fate the edge of Justice' sword, designed  
 For other deeds of harm, is setting

τράπωμεν. The former, which Paley supports, seems slightly the more probable, on account of the known preference of the Greeks for the formal accusative after the principal verb, noticed already on v. 1337.

1506. ψέκας δὲ λήγει is equivalent to the adverb ἀστακτὶ, "non guttatim sed copioso flumine," as Paley remarks.

1507. "Vulgo δίκη et θήγει, contra sensum et metrum. Mutarunt Aueretus et Herm. Fatum acuit justitiam ad aliud negotium incipiendum in alia cote calamitatis." Paley. It

is better however in every way to join πράγμα with βλάβης. Klausen objects to the reading δίκην, "quod justum est non potest acui:" as if the metaphor meant more than that Fate was preparing just vengeance. It is difficult to see on what ground an objection like this is urged, as æsthetically justice may be regarded with perfect propriety as a weapon in the hands of Fate, while morally there is nothing more inconsistent in an edge being given to justice than in the passages quoted by Peile from the Psalms (VII. 12) and Deuteronomy (XXXII. 41), or in-



πρὸς ἄλλαις θηγάναισι Μοῖρα.

ΧΟ. ἰὼ γὰ γὰ, εἴθ' ἔμ' ἐδέξω, σύστ. ε'.  
 πρὶν τόνδ' ἐσιδεῖν ἀργυροτοίχου 1510  
 δροίτας κατέχοντα χαμεύναν.  
 τίς ὁ θάψων νιν, τίς ὁ θρηνήσων;  
 ἢ σὺ τόδ' ἔρξαι  
 τλήσει, κτείνας' ἄνδρα τὸν αὐτῆς,  
 ἀποκωκῦσαι ψυχὴν, ἄχαριν 1515  
 χάριν ἀντ' ἔργων  
 μεγάλων ἀδίκως ἐπικρᾶναι;

ΗΜ. Β'. τίς δ' ἐπιτύμβιον αἶνον ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ θείῳ στρ. ζ'.  
 ξὺν δακρύσιν ἰάπτων 1520  
 ἀληθείᾳ φρενῶν πανήσει;

ΚΛ. οὐ σὲ προσήκει τὸ μέλημα λέγειν σύστ. ζ'.  
 τοῦτο· πρὸς ἡμῶν  
 κάππεσε, κάτθανε, καὶ καταθάψομεν,  
 οὐχ ὑπὸ κλαυθμῶν τῶν ἐξ οἴκων,  
 ἀλλ' Ἰφιγένειά νιν ἀσπασίως 1525  
 θυγατὴρ, ὡς χρή,  
 πατέρ' ἀντιάσασα πρὸς ὠκύπορον  
 πόρθμευμ' ἀχέων,  
 περὶ χεῖρε βαλοῦσα φιλήσει.

deed than in Klausen's own explanation of δίκη; for if justice itself cannot be sharpened without exceeding itself, neither can its sword, which is in fact its executive power. In a similar strain he objects to the common interpretation of ὑπερδίκως in v. 1363.

1517. "μεγάλα ἔργα, facta quæ justos fines excedunt, ut μεγαλόμητις de superbo dictum v. 1348 (1395). Cf. Theb. 565." Klausen.

1518. I cannot follow Wellauer, Klausen and Peile in restoring the old reading ἐπιτύμβιος αἶνος. The

image of a dirge darting itself on a man, and being afflicted in sincerity of heart, is highly unnatural: and the last words in particular, ἀληθείᾳ φρενῶν, show that a man must be intended. Æschylus is undoubtedly fond of personifications, but they are such as can afford to be tested per se by the rules of æsthetical criticism, even if they should not happen to suit the level of the subject described. It may be a piece of bombast to call Dust the brother of Mud; but there is nothing inconsistent in the conception, which

With other means of whetting.  
 O Earth! hadst thou ta'en me to thee, before  
 I had seen him stretched on the lowly floor  
 Of the silver-sided laver!  
 And who shall bury him? who shall grieve?  
 Wouldst thou in thy daring the work achieve,  
 To bewail the life that thyself hast spilt  
 And atone thy guilt  
 By the wrongful, thankless favour?  
 Who, speaking o'er the godlike hero's bier  
 His praise with many a tear  
 Shall grieve in tenderness sincere?

CLY. And why shouldst thou for these cares provide?  
 They are not for thee!  
 'Twas by us, by us he fell, he died,  
 And we ourselves will inter him, we!  
 Not with lament from the palace sent,  
 But Iphigenia, his child, as is meet,  
 With tenderest love shall her father greet  
 By the rapid flow of the stream of woe,  
 And throw round her arms embracing!

is only a carrying out of the principle of attributing human relations to the different parts of nature. So a dirge might be personified, equally with a disease in v. 1419: it must however by the fact of personification, abdicate some of its natural functions, and, if it is made to suffer, it cannot be darted on a man any more than Dust, when recognised as the brother of Mud, can be thrown over a man, or be trampled. In a word, a thing is personified solely in order that it may perform a human part; though even there a poet would endeavour not to offend by being too definite, and avoid attributing *φρενές* to an inanimate object, especially if it be one which has not been previously associated

with human imagery, and is only personified for the occasion. These considerations might not be sufficient in themselves to prove that Æschylus could not have written *ἐπιτύμβιος αἶνος*: but where a reading at once so unobjectionable in itself, and so near the received text as *ἐπιτύμβιον αἶνον* (Is. Voss's correction) offers itself, they appear decidedly to turn the scale in its favour. Between *δακρύοις* and *δάκρυον* there is not much to choose. The former is found in the Farnese MS.; but this need only prove that it is due to Triclinius, while the latter is more likely to have been corrupted into the old reading *δακρύοις*.

1529. Here again is a simple question of probabilities between *χείρα*

ΗΜ. Α'. ὄνειδος ἤκει τόδ' ἀντ' ὀνείδους·

ἀντιστρ. ε'.

δύσμαχα δ' ἔστι κρίναι.

1531

φέρει φέροντ', ἐκτίνει δ' ὁ καίνων.

μίμνει δέ, μίμνοντος ἐν χρόνῳ Διὸς,

παθεῖν τὸν ἔρξαντα· θέσμιον γάρ.

τίς ἂν γονὰν ἀραῖον ἐκβάλῃ δόμων;

1535

κεκόλληται γένος πρὸς ἅτα.

ΧΟ.

\* \* \*

ἀντισύστ. ε'.

\* \* \*

\* \* \*

\* \* \*

\* \* \*

\* \* \*

\* \* \*

\* \* \*

\* \* \*

ΗΜ. Β'.

\* \* \*

ἀντιστρ. 5'.

\* \* \*

\* \* \*

ΚΛ. εἰς τόνδ' ἐνέβης ξὺν ἀληθείᾳ

ἀντισύστ. 5'.

χρησμόν· ἐγὼ δ' οὖν

ἐθελῶ, δαίμονι τῷ Πλεισθενιδᾶν

and Porson's correction *χεῖρε*, the result of which, as in similar cases before noticed, seems to be that the variation from the natural expression is more likely to have been made by the inattention of the transcribers than by the intention of the author.

1530. *ὄνειδος* refers not to the scoff just uttered by Clytæmnestra, but to the murder of Agamemnon, as the context shows. It will then mean, "res quæ exprobrari potest," a thing to be mentioned for blame, a sense which it bears in many other places, several of which the com-

mentators have collected, e. g. Soph. *Œd. T.* 543, quoted by Peile. I believe too that it should be restored to a corrupt passage in the *Choeph.* v. 1021, where the reading of the MSS. is *ἄλλος ἂν εἰ δὴ τοῦτ' ἀρ' οἶδ' ὅπη τελεῖ*. If we read *ἄλλοις ὀνειδῇ ταῦτ' ἀρ' οἶδ' ὅπη τελεῖ*, "these reproaches must reach others ere they end, and I know which way it will be," *οἶδ' ὅπη* having a parenthetical force, like *οἶδ' ὅτι* in Soph. *Ant.* 276, we shall obtain a clear and consistent sense, a declaration on the part of Orestes that the family *ὀνειδῇ* are not stopped by the death of

CHO. Thus reproach unto reproach succeedeth ;  
 Hard, the right to tell.  
 So the spoiler's spoiled, the bloody bleedeth !  
 For it remains while Zeus remains in time,  
 The doer still must suffer for his crime.  
 Yea, it is ruled in Heaven !—Who shall expel  
 The brood of curses, justly hated ?  
 The race to woe is mated !

CLY. Aye now, thou hast touched on this decree  
 With truth—but I  
 With the Pleisthenid demon would fain agree

Clytæmnestra, but will yet have another victim, himself.

1532. *φέρει φέροντ'* is a gnomic expression, both in matter and form, "There is that spoileth the spoiler," as Peile observes, supporting his interpretation, which is also that of Haupt and others, against Klausen's objection that the middle, *φέρεται*, would then be required, by a reference to Sept. 351. *ἀρπαγαὶ δὲ διαδρομῶν ὁμαίμονες· ξυμβολεῖ φέρων φέροντι, καὶ κενὸς κενὸν καλεῖ.*

1533. "*ἐν χρόνῳ*. *sensus est, hæc lex manet quamdiu manebit Zeus.*" Paley. The meaning is sufficiently plain, if we do not disturb it by any philosophical notions about the difference between time and eternity ; and it is equally needless to adopt, with Klausen, Blomfield's harsh construction, *ἐν χρόνῳ παθεῖν τὸν ἔρξαντα*, and to read with Schutz and Dindorf *ἐν θρόνῳ*. Sophocles has a similar expression in Ant. 607. *οὗτ' ἀκάματοι θεῶν μῆνες, ἀγήρῳ δὲ χρόνῳ κατέχεις . . . αἶγλαν.*

1534. A full stop has been placed after *θέσμιον γάρ*, at the suggestion of Symmons, approved by Butler (apud Peile) and Paley. By adopting it we not only give more force to the maxim just delivered, but assist the sense of what follows, which is not, as Peile gives it, "for who can drive away from his home

a brood of curses expressly ordained to dwell there?" but, "who can cast out the accursed race from *this* house?" a question which needs no *γάρ* to introduce it. *ἀπαῖον*, Hermann's correction for *ῥᾶον*, and *πρὸς ἄτῃ*, Blomfield's for *προσάψαι*, are both so indisputable, that it is hardly requisite to particularize them as departures from the reading of the MSS.

1537. Peile is probably correct in supposing that the lost verses were partially at least occupied with enforcing the *χρησμός* of the preceding antistrophe, and in consequently reading *ἐνέβης* for *ἐνέβη*, after Canter. Burney fills up the lacuna by repeating vv. 1509–1520, and Blomfield and Dindorf follow him : but in that case it would be strange that Clytæmnestra should reply only to the first part of the words of the Chorus, unless it be said that having heard the rest before, she could afford to pass them over. The passage too would not be very consistent with the turn which the thoughts of the Chorus have now taken, passing from their own sorrow to the contemplation of the moral law developed in the series of family crimes and misfortunes. Compare however the context of *σύστ. γ'. στρ. δ.* and that of *ἀντισύστ. γ'. ἀντιστρ. δ.*

ὄρκους θεμένη, τάδε μὲν στέργειν, 1540  
 δύστλητά περ' ὄνθ'· ὃ δὲ λοιπὸν, ἰόντ'  
 ἐκ τῶνδε δόμων, ἄλλην γενεὰν  
 τρίβειν θάνατοις αὐθένταισιν.

κτεάνων τε μέρος  
 βαιὸν ἐχούσῃ πᾶν ἀπόχρη μοι, 1545  
 κάλληλοφόνους  
 μανίας μελάθρων ἀφελούσῃ.

## ΑΙΓΙΣΘΟΣ.

ὦ φέγγος εὖφρον ἡμέρας δικηφόρου·  
 φαίην ἂν ἤδη νῦν βροτῶν τιμαόρους  
 θεοὺς ἄνωθεν γῆς ἐποπτεύειν ἄχῃ, 1550  
 ἰδὼν ὑφαντοῖς ἐν πέπλοις Ἑρινύων  
 τὸν ἄνδρα τόνδε κείμενον φίλως ἐμοὶ,  
 χερὸς πατρώας ἐκτίνοντα μηχανάς.  
 Ἄτρεὺς γὰρ ἄρχων τῆσδε γῆς, τούτου πατὴρ,  
 πατέρα Θυέστην τὸν ἐμὸν, ὥς τορῶς φράσαι, 1555  
 αὐτοῦ τ' ἄδελφον, ἀμφίλεκτος ὦν κράτει,  
 ἠνδρηλάτησεν ἐκ πόλεώς τε καὶ δόμων.  
 καὶ προστρόπαιος ἐστίας μολὼν πάλιν  
 τλήμων Θυέστης μοῖραν εὔρετ' ἀσφαλῆ,  
 τὸ μὴ θανὼν πατρῶον αἰμάξαι πέδον 1560  
 αὐτοῦ· ξένια δὲ τοῦδε δύσθεος πατὴρ

1546. κάλληλοφόνους is Canter's correction of δ' ἄλληλοφόνους. "The two conditions being taken in close and inseparable connection, the sense of the passage is: *I am quite content to have but a small portion of goods in possession, and withal to have removed from the house self-slaughtering acts of madness: i. e. provided always I shall have removed.*" Peile.

1550. For ἄχῃ Auratus and many of the subsequent editors read ἄγῃ:

but see on v. 1218.

1555. "ὥς τορῶς φράσαι respicit eam quæ præcedit, disertam patris utriusque et filii utriusque mentionem." Klausen.

1556. Peile successfully vindicates the common reading αὐτοῦ τ' ἄδελφον, on the ground that τε may be omitted in the former member of the sentence when the presence of the article limits the application of both members to one and the same person, while the clause in which αὐτοῦ

Upon oath, with our destiny here to comply  
 'Though heavy its woe—for the rest, he may go  
 Away from us, and to death consign  
 By his kindred murders some other line.  
 To me let the barest pittance fall,  
 I were well content, from the palace-hall  
 This madness of bloodshed chasing!

ÆGISTHUS.

O welcome dawning of a righteous day!  
 Now would I say, in guardian care for men  
 The Gods from high look down upon Earth's woes,  
 Once having seen in Fury-woven raiment  
 This man here stretched in pleasing sort for me,  
 Paying the scheming of his father's hand.  
 For Atreus, this land's ruler, and his father,  
 Drove out my sire, Thyestes, to speak plainly,  
 Being besides his brother, on a strife  
 About the sovereignty, from house and home.  
 And then returning suppliant to the hearth  
 The poor Thyestes found a lot of safety,  
 Not with his blood to stain his father's floor  
 In death.—But Atreus, this man's impious sire,

stands needs not be reflexive, but only incidentally thrown in as the speaker's elucidation of his own narrative. Critics have in general shown much too strong a disposition to alter passages in which *τε* is similarly used, e. g. Eurip. Iph. Aul. 1153, 1455, where I once (in an article in the Classical Museum, No. IV.) was inclined to acquiesce in the corrections proposed, but now see reason to alter my opinion. Paley, who defended the use of *τε* in v. 1497, here rather leans to *αὐτοῦ δ' ἀμφίλεκτος ὃν κράτει*, "being called in question in the matter of dominion." Peile.

1560. This is another of the in-

stances noticed on v. 1257, which show that the infinitive is really a noun. So in v. 1138 τὸ μὴ—παθεῖν is a noun in apposition to *ἄκος*.

1561. "*αὐτοῦ*. illic, non video quare vulgatum mutare velint critici. Sæpissime occurrit *αὐτοῦ* hoc sensu, ut *αὐτοῦ ἐνὶ Τροίῃ* Hom. supra v. 439 (437)." Paley. If any correction be admitted, it must be Hermann's *ἀστροξένια*, which, as Peile allows, is very plausible, being the proper word for hospitality shown to persons in the condition of Thyestes, οἱ ἐκ προγόνων μὲν ἀστῶν, αὐτοὶ δὲ ξένοι καὶ ἀνανεώσεως δεόμενοι, the definition of *ἀστροξένοι* given by Eustathius on Il. III. p. 405. 33.

Ἄτρεϋς, προθύμως μάλλον ἢ φίλως, πατρὶ  
 τῷ ᾿μῷ, κρεουργὸν ἡμᾶρ εὐθύμως ἄγειν  
 δοκῶν, παρέσχε δαῖτα παιδείων κρεῶν.  
 τὰ μὲν ποδῆρῃ καὶ χερῶν ἄκρους κτένας  
 ἔθρυπτ' ἄνωθεν ἀνδρακὰς καθήμενος.  
 ἄσημα δ' αὐτῶν αὐτίκ' ἀγνοία λαβὼν,  
 ἔσθει βορὰν ἄσωτον, ὥς ὁρᾷς, γένει.  
 κᾶπειτ' ἐπιγνοὺς ἔργον οὐ καταίσιον,  
 ὦμωξεν, ἀμπίπτει δ' ἀπὸ σφαγῆς ἐμῶν.  
 μόρον δ' ἄφερτον Πελοπίδαις ἐπεύχεται,  
 λάκτισμα δείπνου ξυνδίκως τιθεὶς ἀρᾷ,  
 οὕτως ὀλέσθαι πᾶν τὸ Πλεισθένους γένος.

1565

1570

1563. “ κρεουργὸν ἡμᾶρ. *Dies quo celebratur visceratio*. Post sacrificia facta populo carnum distributio fiebat, recentioribus dicta κρεοδαισία, κρεοδοσία, κρεανομία. Sed hic ceperim simplicius pro *die festo in quo convivis carnes apponebantur*. Odyss. ο'. 240. πὰρ δὲ Βοηθοῖδης κρέα δαίετο καὶ νέμε μοίρας. Est autem κρεουργὸς *lanius*.” Blomfield. Compare the sacrificial sense of ῥέζειν, ποιεῖν, and the Latin *facere, operari*.

1565. τὰ per ποδῆρῃ. Peile has the merit of having extracted a satisfactory sense from this passage as it stands, without the aid of any corrections, by pointing out that ἔθρωπτ' ἄνωθεν means “kept breaking off from the parts above,” and leaving the next words to their natural signification, “seated apart,” i. e. in order to do the work unobserved. Bothe and Paley understand ἄνωθεν of Atreus *sitting at the head of the table*; but this, if not absolutely inconsistent with the notion of his sitting apart, at any rate would encumber the description of an incidental fact, and give an extra adverb to καθήμενος, even supposing ἄνωθεν καθῆσθαι, an adverb of motion joined with a verb of rest, to be

justified by ὑποκάτω κατακλίνεσθαι in Plat. Symp. p. 222. The change of the nominative in v. 1567 is harsh, but does not prove any corruption in the text, as the poet may have considered the sense sufficiently plain to allow him to dispense with the use of another pronoun.

1572. It is not easy to see why the commentators in general have sought to avoid the natural meaning of λάκτισμα δείπνου, which is quite in keeping with the whole picture, Thyestes shrieking, falling back from the table and vomiting, then spurning the banquet with his feet, and uttering a curse. In Ovid's account of the banquet of Tereus (Met. VI. 661) there is a precisely parallel passage, “Thracius ingenti mensas clamore repellit.” This Blomfield quotes, but, singularly enough, prefers understanding the text here of the rebelling of Thyestes' stomach against the food, and compares Prom. 906. κραδία δὲ φόβῳ φρένα λακτίζει. Butler makes λάκτισμα δείπνου equivalent to δείπνον λακτίσματος ἄξιον, “an abominable feast,” though in his first edition he had taken it as I have done. Schutz, with whom Dindorf apparently a-

To feast my sire, with more of zeal than love,  
 Professing with glad cheer to keep a feast-day,  
 Served him a banquet of his children's flesh.  
 The parts about the feet and finger-tips,  
 Seated apart, he broke from those above—  
 While *he* in ignorance taking the unknown mess  
 Eats up, thou seest, a curse to his whole house.  
 Then, upon knowledge of the unholy deed,  
 He shrieks, and falls in vomit from his carving,  
 And on the race of Pelops calls down doom  
 Spurning the feast along with his just curse,  
 So perish all the line of Pleisthenes !—

grees, says, “pertinet ad contemtam et violatam immani comine convivii sanctitatem :” and much to the same effect is Paley’s “violatas hospitii leges.” Peile has advocated the natural interpretation, and so perhaps Klausen, though he does not explain the word in its place, but in his summary of the sense on v. 1510 (1565) renders it generally, “epularum horrorem.” He is however more explicit in his version of *ξυνδίκως τιθεῖς*, “uno jure jungens,” which Peile in his note further develops and illustrates, showing the sense to be, “making the act of trampling the banquet under foot plead together with the imprecation,” or, as I have given it, so as equally to preserve the force of *δίκη* in *ξυνδίκως*, which Paley is wrong in supposing to be for the time suspended, “spurning the feast along with his just curse.” I do not mean to say that Æschylus might not have used *συνδίκος* or *συνήγορος* simply for a helper, the *δίκη* in which the two were supposed to make common cause being a purely imaginary one, but that as a matter of fact the word is used here with more exactness, representing the trampling and the curse as both parties in an appeal to Heaven, assumed

to be a just one, in Thyestes’ behalf.

1573. “These are the very words of Thyestes; and they are worthy of especial remark, inasmuch as they both prove that our poet, who here represents the race of Pleisthenes as coextensive, and in fact a convertible term with the Pelopidæ, held Pleisthenes to be, if not the father, at least the son of Pelops, and in themselves moreover exhibit a truly awful conception of that mysterious power which compels Thyestes, as if under an evil spell, to curse himself no less than his brother, and so to entail upon the families of both those alternate acts of vengeance which end not with the murder of Agamemnon, but are yet to be developed in the succeeding portions of the Trilogy. Compare a similar imprecation in the mouth of Eteocles, Theb. 689–91. ἐπεὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα κάρτ’ ἐπισπέρχει θεὸς, ἴτω κατ’ οὖρον, κῦμα Κωκυτοῦ λαχόν, Φοῖβον στυγῆθην πᾶν τὸ Λαῖον γένος.” Peile. Add Eurip. Phœn. 624. Ἰο. πατρός οὐ φεύξεσθ’ Ἐρινύς; Ἐτ. ἐρρέτω πρόπας δόμος. Paley adopts the account of the Schol. on Hom. π’. 11, and Eurip. Orest. 5, that Agamemnon and Menelaus were really the sons of Pleisthenes, though brought up



ἐκ τῶνδ' εἰ σοὶ πεσόντα τόνδ' ἰδεῖν πάρα.  
 καὶ γὰρ δίκαιος τοῦδε τοῦ φόνου ῥαφεύς·  
 τρίτον γὰρ ὄντα μ' ἐπὶ δέκ' ἀθλίῳ πατρὶ  
 συνεξελαύνει τυτθὸν ὄντ' ἐν σπαργάνοις·  
 τραφέντα δ' αὖθις ἢ δίκη κατήγαγε.  
 καὶ τοῦδε τάνδρὸς ἠψάμην θυραῖος ὦν,  
 πᾶσαν ξυνάψας μηχανὴν δυσβουλίας.  
 οὕτω καλὸν δὴ καὶ τὸ κατθανεῖν ἐμοὶ,  
 ἰδόντα τοῦτον τῆς δίκης ἐν ἔρκεσιν.

1575

1580

ΧΟ. Αἰγισθ', ὑβρίζειν ἐν κακοῖσιν οὐ σέβω.  
 σὺ δ' ἄνδρα τόνδε φῆς ἐκὼν κατακτανεῖν,  
 μόνος δ' ἔποικτον τόνδε βουλευῆσαι φόνον·  
 οὐ φημ' ἀλύξειν ἐν δίκη τὸ σὸν κάρα  
 δημορριφεῖς, σάφ' ἴσθι, λευσίμους ἀράς.

1585

ΑΙ. σὺ ταῦτα φωνεῖς νερτέρᾳ προσήμενος  
 κώπῃ, κρατούντων τῶν ἐπὶ ζυγῷ δορός;

by Atreus their grandfather: but this, while it would reduce Thyestes' curse to an ordinary imprecation on the descendant of his enemy, is inconsistent with the express words of Ægisthus in vv. 1554, 5. 1561, 2, which are evidently intended to be taken strictly, and also with v. 1539, where the δαίμων τῶν Πλεισθενιδᾶν must surely be the same as the δαίμων τῶν Τανταλιδᾶν of vv. 1439, 1447, 1452, and the ἀλάστωρ of Atreus of v. 1472. The exact place which Pleisthenes is meant to occupy in the family it is impossible to ascertain: nor is it worth while to discuss the probability of Peile's hypothesis, that there was an elder as well as a younger Pleisthenes. In v. 1577, ξυνελαύνει would seem to be another instance of the change of nominative, as it is not probable that Agamemnon was the person that drove out Thyestes and Ægisthus, and the lines are only meant

to show that there was a fitness in Ægisthus doing the deed, as having suffered personally as well as through Thyestes, not that Agamemnon had committed any offence himself, it having been already declared in v. 1553, that it is for his father's guilt that he suffers. The introduction of τοῦδε τάνδρὸς in v. 1579 is, as Peile remarks, an argument that the nominative has been changed, and serves in some degree to prevent that confusion which in an ordinary case would make such a change faulty.

1582. Peile is wrong in the distinction which he draws between ἰδόντα and ἰδόντι, as though the latter would have been more ambiguous, as it might possibly have meant, *when I shall have seen*; a sense equally capable of being extracted from the former. All that can be said is, that either might be used here, as ἐμὲ must be supplied for τὸ

Hence 'tis that thou may'st see this man o'erthrown—  
 And I the righteous author of his death!—  
 For me, the thirteenth child, with my poor father  
 He drove away, a babe in swaddling clothes;—  
 But Justice brought me back again, when grown,  
 And, though a stranger, still I reached this man,  
 Having then woven all the web of hate—  
 And now e'en thus 'twere good for me to die  
 So having seen him snared in Justice' toils.

CHO. Ægisthus, insolence in ills I like not.

Thou say'st that thou didst kill this man on purpose,  
 And didst alone devise this piteous deed;—  
 I tell thee thou wilt not in justice 'scape  
 The public curses, be assured, of stoning.

ÆG. Thou talk in this way, sitting at the oar  
 Below, while those above command the ship?

*καταναεῖν*, so that in either case the "having seen" would be predicated of the speaker, though the position of *ἐμοὶ* rather prepares us for a participle agreeing with it. In the one case the notion of *ιδὼν* is taken in connection with that of *καταναεῖν*, in the other separately: but the general thought remains the same.

1583. *ἐν κακοῖσιν*, in ills, whether wrought, as here, by the insulter himself, or as in Soph. Aj. 1140, by some other cause; so that the two passages, together with v. 1107 of the latter play, are essentially parallel, in spite of the distinction taken by Peile. With regard to the remainder of the Chorus' speech, I agree in this opinion of Haupt: "Justam in his orationis compagem desiderantes post versum 1382 (1583) versum excidisse putant. Mihi hæc sic pronunciata videntur senum, tanquam rei capitalis iudicium, nam populi personam sustinent, gravitatis ac severitatis esse." In v. 1585 *ἔποικτον* is questionable, though perhaps not indefensible.

Casaubon's *ἐπακτὸν* has considerable probability in its favour, both in itself, and on account of the case with which *οι* and *a* may have been confused. In Eurip. Medea, v. 45, Porson reads *ἄσεται* for *οἷσεται*, and remarks on the similarity of the vowel to the diphthong, particularly if the former be too widely, or the latter too closely written. In the same way I would read in Æsch. Suppl. 243. *ξυνάσεται* for *ξυνοῖσεται*, as more natural and better agreeing with the interpretation of the Schol., *συμφωνήσει*.—*ἐν δίκη*, v. 1586, may mean "when thou art judged" (and so Haupt); but the common sense "justly" or "in strict justice" is quite sufficient.

1589. "Ordo remigum, *θρανίων*, *ζυγίων*, *θαλαμίων* hic respicitur. Horum primi videntur maximum fuisse momentum in propellenda triremi: secundi majus quam tertii: quare majorem existimationem et majus stipendium habebant. Ceterum hoc loco *τῶν θρανίων* mentionem facere non necessarium erat

- γνώσει, γέρων ὦν, ὥς διδάσκεισθαι βαρὺ  
τῷ τηλικούτῳ, σωφρονεῖν εἰρημένον. 1590  
δεσμὸς δὲ καὶ τὸ γήρας, αἶ τε νήστιδες  
δύαι, διδάσκειν ἐξοχώταται φρενῶν  
ἰατρομάντεις. οὐχ ὁρᾷς ὁρῶν τάδε ;  
πρὸς κέντρα μὴ λάκτιζε, μὴ παίσας μογῆς. 1595
- ΧΟ. γύναι, σὺ τοὺς ἤκοντας ἐκ μάχης νέον  
οἰκουρὸς, εὐνήν ἀνδρὸς αἰσχύνουσ' ἅμα  
ἀνδρὶ στρατηγῷ τόνδ' ἐβούλευσας μόρον ;
- ΑΙ. καὶ ταῦτα τᾶπῃ κλαυμάτων ἀρχηγενῇ.  
'Ορφεὶ δὲ γλώσσαν τὴν ἐναντίαν ἔχεις. 1600  
ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἦγε πάντ' ἀπὸ φθογγῆς χαρᾶ,  
σὺ δ' ἐξορίνας νηπίοις ὑλάγμασιν  
ἄξει· κρατηθεὶς δ' ἡμερώτερος φανεῖ.
- ΧΟ. ὥς δὴ σύ μοι τύραννος Ἀργείων ἔσει,  
ὃς οὐκ, ἐπειδὴ τῷδ' ἐβούλευσας μόρον, 1605  
δρᾶσαι τόδ' ἔργον οὐκ ἔτλης αὐτοκτόνως ;
- ΑΙ. τὸ γὰρ δολῶσαι πρὸς γυναικὸς ἦν σαφῶς·

(nisi cum Blomf. credamus cæsum Agamemnonem ut θρανίτην respici), quia tertius tanto inferior est secundo quanto secundus est primo: quare satis recte se habet comparatio:—δορὸς, πανίς." Paley.

1591. εἰρημένον, the nominative absolute. See on v. 10. προσταγὲν αὐτῷ, Sch. Farn.

1592. "καὶ τὸ γήρας, accusativus pendens a διδάσκειν: *vel senectutem*, cui molestius et difficilior est dicere." Klausen.

1594. οὐχ ὁρᾷς ὁρῶν τάδε; may be taken either as ὁρῶν, οὐχ ὁρᾷς τάδε; as I have taken it, or as οὐχ ὁρᾷς, ὁρῶν τάδε; "Dost not thou see, with this before thy eyes?" i. e. Canst not thou see thy own interest, now that thou seest from this dead body how matters stand?"

1595. Putting aside the question

whether πήσας can be equivalent to παθῶν, on which Paley refers to the Philological Museum I. p. 239, we may assert that even then it would create a mere tautology with μογῆς. Παίσας is in every way preferable to πταίσας, as being supported by external authority (that of the Schol. on Pind. Pyth. II. 173), approaching nearer to the text of the MSS., and affording an apter sense, as it is not stumbling against the pricks, but striking the foot against them, that would be the thing naturally to be dreaded. Πταίσας, as Paley observes, would require a different metaphor, such as one from a stone.

1596. There can be little doubt that τοὺς ἤκοντας is governed by οἰκουρὸς, though Klausen contends against such a notion, and Peile prefers supposing an anacoluthon. It

Old as thou art thou'lt know, 'tis hard to learn  
For one like thee, when prudence is the lesson.  
Nay, prison, e'en for age, and the sharp pangs  
Of famine, are most excellent physicians  
To cure the mind. Canst see and seest not this?  
Kick not against the pricks, lest thou be hurt.

CHO. Woman, didst thou on watch for those who came  
From battle, staining too thy husband's bed,  
Thus plot against a chieftain and a soldier?

ÆG. These words too will be parents of thy harm,  
In truth thy tongue is opposite to Orpheus',  
For he led all for joy by his sweet voice,  
But thou by thy fond barkings angering us  
Shalt be led out!—When tamed thou wilt be gentler!

CHO. What? I see thee the ruler of the Argives,  
Who after thou hadst plotted this man's death  
Darest not thyself with thine own hand to slay him?

ÆG. Aye! for this craft was just a woman's part,

will not be denied that if *οἰκουρεῖν* *ἀνδρὰ* can stand, *οἰκουρὸς ἀνδρὰ* may stand also: and the use of the former is not disproved by the passage Klausen quotes, v. 778, *πόλιν οἰκουρεῖν*. The fact is, *οἰκουρεῖν* is properly an intransitive verb, containing in itself its own object, *οἶκος*; it may however be used as if it were no derivative, but a simple word, as in the case of *πόλιν οἰκουρεῖν*, which is a pleonasm like *νέκταρ ἐωνοχόει*. Thus it becomes equivalent to *τηρεῖν*, and can take after it an accusative of the person, though in that case its employment involves not a pleonasm but an absolute catachresis, if its original force as a compound be considered.

1602. I see nothing in Peile's interpretation of this line with Jacobs' reading *νηπίους* to justify the "wonder" which Paley expresses. The sense apparently is, "The ef-

fects of thy tongue are opposite to those of Orpheus'. He led every thing from the pleasure of listening to him: thou wilt indeed move thy hearers, but it will be *by* foolish barking, and *to* anger,—and so far from being able to lead them, thou wilt end with being led away thyself." Pauw's *ἡπίους*, as Wellauer has remarked, would be probable, if for *πάντα* in the line before there were *τὰ ἄγρια* or some similar word; but as the passage stands, it is not likely that such a contrast was intended. Klausen's interpretation of *ἡπίους* in an ironical sense cannot be called a natural one, as *ἡπίος* has first to be taken actively, an explanation which, though undoubtedly admissible, is not an obvious one, and even then we should rather expect some other expression, like *ὑλακτικοῖς ἡπιάμασιν*.

- ἐγὼ δ' ὕποπτος ἐχθρὸς ἢ παλαιγενής.  
 ἐκ τῶν δὲ τοῦδε χρημάτων πειράσομαι  
 ἄρχειν πολιτῶν· τὸν δὲ μὴ πειθάνορα  
 ζεύξω βαρείαις οὔτι μοι σειραφόρον  
 κριθῶντα πῶλον· ἀλλ' ὁ δυσφιλὴς σκότῳ  
 λιμὸς ξύνοικος μαλθακὸν σφ' ἐπόψεται.  
 ΧΟ. τί δὴ τὸν ἄνδρα τόνδ' ἀπὸ ψυχῆς κακῆς  
 οὐκ αὐτὸς ἠνάριζες, ἀλλὰ νιν γυνή,  
 χώρας μίασμα καὶ θεῶν ἐγχωρίων,  
 ἔκτειν' ; Ὀρέστης ἄρα που βλέπει φάος,  
 ὅπως κατελθὼν δεῦρο πρευμενεί τύχη  
 ἀμφοῖν γένηται τοῖνδε παγκρατῆς φονεύς ;  
 ΑΙ. ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ δοκεῖς τάδ' ἔρδειν καὶ λέγειν, γνῶσει τάχα. 1620  
 ΧΟ. εἶα δὴ, φίλοι λοχίται, τοῦργον οὐχ ἐκὰς τόδε.  
 ΑΙ. \* \* \* \* \*  
 ΧΟ. εἶα δὴ, ξίφος πρόκωπον πᾶς τις εὐτρεπιζέτω.  
 ΑΙ. ἀλλὰ καὶ γὰρ μὴν πρόκωπος οὐκ ἀναίνομαι θανεῖν.  
 ΧΟ. δεχομένοις λέγεις θανεῖν σε· τὴν τύχην δ' ἐρώμεθα.

1611. βαρείαις, a case where the substantive has to be supplied from the verb. Οὔτι μὴ σειραφόρον can hardly be explained "ut non sit funalis," with Klausen and Peile, the latter of whom thinks an additional *mental* negative is required after οὔτι, nor yet with Paley as if the construction were ζεύξω βαρείαις, οὐ μὴ ζεύξω ὥς σειραφόρον. οὔτι μοι σειραφόρον (Porson) will mean "not a trace-horse for me, i. e. not such a one as I would make my trace-horse, as Agamemnon says of Ulysses, v. 811. ζευχθεὶς ἔτοιμος ἦν ἐμοὶ σειραφόρος, where it is not clear whether the speaker means a horse pulling *with* him as its fellow, or pulling *for* him as its driver, as here, though so much is evident from these and other passages, that the trace-horse was one that had a great deal of liberty, and so was

required not to be unmanageable.

1612. δυσφιλὴς σκότῳ MSS., δυσφιλεῖ σκότῳ Stanley, δυσφιλὴς σκότῳ Pearson. The latter seems preferable, not merely as slightly nearer the MSS. reading, but as more in accordance with other passages where the epithet is similarly placed, such as κάσις πηλοῦ ξύνουρος in v. 475. Peile thinks δυσφιλεῖ σκότῳ better, as it is *unnatural* darkness that is meant: but this may be readily inferred, and on the other side it may be urged, that "the unwelcome comrade of darkness" is more forcible than "the companion of unwelcome darkness," as pointing out more directly what the prisoner has to expect from such a companionship. But on so slight a matter reasoning becomes mere refinement.

1615. αὐτὸς here is probably to be interpreted by αὐτοκτόνως v. 1606,

But I was his old enemy, and suspect.

Now by the assistance of his wealth I'll try  
To rule the state: but him who'll not obey  
I'll yoke in heavy style, no trace-horse for me,  
A stall-fed colt! Yes! hunger, the stern comrade  
Of darkness, shall behold him softened soon.

CHO. Why didst thou then with that base heart of thine  
Not kill the man thyself? but 'twas a woman,  
Pollution of the land and the land's gods,  
Slew him.—Orestes!—is he yet alive,  
That here returning by auspicious chance  
He in his might may put them both to death?

ÆG. But if such thy thoughts and language, thou shalt find  
it out with speed.

CHO. Come then! come! my friends and comrades—not at  
distance is the need.

ÆG. \* \* \* \* \*

CHO. Come along! let each be ready, grasping tight his  
falchion's hilt!

ÆG. I too grasp my falchion tightly, and will not refuse  
to die.

CHO. Die! we take the word with pleasure: now then,  
Fortune let us try!

so that *οὐκ* cannot well be defended. Besides, the Chorus would be more likely to speak of Clytæmnestra as having taken on herself the whole risk of the murder, than to admit that Ægisthus had any part in it. Paley explains *τί δὴ* by *εἰ πρὸς γυναῖκος ἦν δολῶσαι*: but *δολῶσαι* refers only to the final stratagem, not the whole scheme of the murder, of which Ægisthus, v. 1580, declares, and the Chorus, v. 1605, admits, that he is the author, so that on that shewing the deed would naturally devolve on Clytæmnestra. The course of thought would rather be the same as that in the last speech of the Chorus, "If thou art to set up as tyrant of Argos, and must

needs threaten us so boldly, why couldst thou not shew thy bravery in killing Agamemnon with thine own hand?"

1621, 3. Of the various methods of arranging these lines, the most probable is that which supposes a line, spoken by Ægisthus, to have been lost after v. 1621: vv. 1628, 35, 43, 4, contain sufficient proofs to prepare us for any loss in this part of the play.

1624. *ἐρώμεθα*, Schutz's correction of *ἐρούμεθα* is justly preferred by Peile to *αἰρούμεθα* (Canter) and *ἐλνούμεθα*, either of which, as he remarks, would produce only a repetition of *δεχομένοις*.

- ΚΛ. μηδαμῶς, ὧ φίλτατ' ἀνδρῶν, ἄλλα δράσωμεν κακά· 1625  
 ἀλλὰ καὶ τάδ' ἐξαμῆσαι πολλὰ δύστηνον θέρος·  
 πημονῆς δ' ἄλις γ' ὑπάρχει· μηδὲν αἱματώμεθα.  
 στείχετε δ', οἱ γέροντες, πρὸς δόμους πεπρωμένους [τούσδε]  
 πρὶν παθεῖν ἔρξαι τ' ἄκαιρον· χρῆν τάδ' ὥς ἐπράξαμεν.  
 εἰ δέ τοι μόχθων † γένοιτο, τῶνδ' ἄλις γ' ἐχοίμεθ' ἄν, 1630  
 δαίμονος χολῇ βαρεῖα δυστυχῶς πεπληγμένοι.  
 ὧδ' ἔχει λόγος γυναικὸς, εἴ τις ἀξιοῖ μαθεῖν.
- ΑΙ. ἀλλὰ τούσδε μοι ματαίαν γλῶσσαν ὧδ' ἀπανθίσαι,  
 κᾶκβαλεῖν ἔπη τοιαῦτα, δαίμονος πειρωμένους,  
 σῶφρονος γνώμης δ' ἁμαρτεῖν, τὸν κρατοῦντα \* \* 1635
- ΧΟ. οὐκ ἂν Ἀργείων τόδ' εἴη, φῶτα προσσαίνειν κακόν.
- ΑΙ. ἀλλ' ἐγὼ σ' ἐν ὑστέραισιν ἡμέραις μέτειμ' ἔτι.
- ΧΟ. οὐκ, εἰ δαίμων Ὀρέστην δεῦρ' ἀπευθύνη μολεῖν.
- ΑΙ. οἶδ' ἐγὼ φεύγοντας ἄνδρας ἐλπίδας σιτουμένους.

/6 1§28. The true reading of this line it seems impossible to conjecture with any certainty. All that we can tell is that *στείχεθ' οἱ γέροντες πρὸς δόμους πεπρωμένους* is correct so far as it goes, but what is to be made of *τούσδε*, which in the old text concludes the line, whether ἤδη is to be inserted at all, and if so, whether with Porson after *γέροντες*, or with Blomfield after *στείχετε*, are questions to which the data before us do not supply answers.—*πεπρωμένους* in this connection is not an unnatural epithet, especially if we look to *χρῆν* in the next line. Clytæmnestra means to say, “We have had our fill of bloodshed, but it was no more than was forced on us by Fate: this new quarrel we are allowed to decline: it is not necessary to exceed our destiny, and yours is to remain quietly at home.” In the next line Musgrave’s *ἔρξαι τ' ἄκαιρον* is not wholly satisfactory, as we should rather expect ἢ ἔρξαι τι

*ἄκαιρον*: it is however the best which has been proposed. *χρῆν τάδ' ὥς ἐπράξαμεν* is equivalent to *ἐπράξαμεν τάδε ὥς χρῆν*.

1630. Peile’s interpretation, “if there might be found a point at which to cry Hold! Enough of these troubles, we would lay hold upon it,” is somewhat forced, and not consistent with v. 1627. *πημονῆς δ' ἄλις γ' ὑπάρχει*. Paley would read *δεχοίμεθ' ἄν*. It is better to point after *γένοιτο*, as the verse seems to direct, supposing the sense to be “But if there should ever be a case of troubles (*μόχθων* a partitive genitive, and *τῷ* a probable, though perhaps not necessary correction of *τοι*), we might surely think ourselves sufficiently compassed by them.” But possibly *γένοιτο* may be a mistake for *πένοιτο*, which might easily be confounded with it from the similarity of Γ and Π. Compare *Eum.* 431, *τῶν σοφῶν γὰρ οὐ πενεί*. *δέοιτο* was long since proposed by Stanley in



CLY. Do not, do not, my beloved one, let us plunge in ill  
more deep.

Here we have a crop already of full many a woe to reap.  
Suffering there is here in plenty: let us have no blood-  
shed now.

Haste—depart, old men, in safety to the homes your  
Fates allow,

Ere you do or suffer mischief: we but acted as was  
willed.

Oh! if ever man had troubles, sure our souls with  
them were filled,

Crushed and beaten to our ruin by the demon's anger  
stern.

Here you have a woman's counsel, should there be a  
wish to learn.

ÆG. But that these should fling upon me their tongue-  
valiant folly's bloom,

And should throw about such language, madly playing  
with their doom,

And desert the path of judgment, and resist the  
ruler's will—

CHO. 'Tis not in an Argive's nature, thus to court a man  
of ill.

ÆG. Well, in after days thou'lt find me following close upon  
thy track.

CHO. Never, should the favouring powers vouchsafe to lead  
Orestes back.

ÆG. Ah, I know that banished people make their daily food  
of hope.

the same sense. In that case we should probably have to read *τις* for *τοι* with Schutz.

1635. This line also cannot be printed complete in the present state of the text. Neither Peile's *προσκυεῖν* (a supposed apposition with *σώφρονος γνώμης*) nor Blomfield's *δ* (Paley *θ*) *ὑβρίσαι* are abstractedly unlikely: the latter I have

followed in the translation. The infinitives are obviously indignant exclamations, as in Aristoph. *Aves* vv. 5. 7, and in Virgil's *Mene desistere*, &c., being, as noticed above, really nouns, so that any proposal to supply the lacuna with words like *πῶς πρέπει* (Klausen) is not likely to be the true one.



ΧΟ. πράσσε, πιαίνου, μαίνων τὴν δίκην· ἐπεὶ πάρα. 1640

ΑΙ. ἴσθι μοι δώσων ἄποινα τῇσδε μωρίας χάριν.

ΧΟ. κόμπασον θαρσῶν, ἀλέκτωρ ὥστε θηλείας πέλας.

ΚΛ. μὴ προτιμήσης ματαίων τῶνδ' ὑλαγμάτων. ἐγὼ  
καὶ σὺ θήσομεν κρατοῦντε τῶνδε δωμάτων καλῶς.

1643, 4. ἐγὼ and καλῶς, though not in the MSS. may be regarded as certain, from the words of the Schol. ἐγὼ, φησὶ, καὶ σὺ κρατοῦντες τῶνδε τῶν δωμάτων διαθησόμεθα τὰ καθ' αὐτοὺς καλῶς. Heath wished to read με προτιμήσης, and Musgrave τῶνδ' ὑλαγμα· πάντ' ἐγώ: but προτιμήσης

CHO. Prosper, gorge on right perverted : now thou hast an ample scope.

ÆG. Know that thou shalt pay me dearly for this folly, soon or late.

CHO. Aye ! go boasting in thy valour, like a cock beside his mate.

CLY. Never waste attention longer on these curs' insensate yell ;

Thou and I will rule the palace, and establish all things well.

appears to be used intransitively, with a genitive after it as after other words signifying *regard*, as Peile maintains, referring to Matthiæ Gr.

Gr. § 348. In the same way *θαυμάζω* is constructed with either a genitive or an accusative.

## ADDITIONS.

244. Klausen's *εὖ πράξις* is, as Peile has remarked, confirmed by a similar form of expression in v. 481. *εὖ γὰρ πρὸς εὖ φανείσι προσθήκη πέλοι.*

439. *εὖμορφοι* may be intended to signify that the bodies in this case were not burnt, like those which had to be sent home, but buried, a practice not less common in ancient times (see Dict. of Antiqq. art. Funus), and sufficiently recognised by Æschylus, v. 841. Sept. 949.

543. If *δρόσοι* is supposed here to be masculine, *λειμώνιαι* must of course be altered, either into *λειμώνιοι*, or, as is more probable, with Blomfield after Schutz, into *λειμωνίας*.

574. There are three ways in which this line may be taken: (1) "I seemed (to myself or to others) to be made to waver by such talk as this:" (2) "by such showing I appeared to be a waverer" (Peile, who renders *πλαγκτός* *mad*: Klausen's "*talibus orationibus, id est, iis qui hæc dicebant,*" and Bernhardt's "*ut ex talibus orationibus conjectandum,*" are only variations of the same general exposition, the drift of which is to separate *λόγοις* from *πλαγκτός*): (3) "it was by such words" (not the words of the Chorus, but the intelligence of the watchman who saw the beacon) "that I seemed to be beguiled." The second seems on the whole preferable, as in the first the sneer is not sufficiently apparent, while *λόγοις τοιούτοις* is more naturally referred to the words immediately preceding than to any thing else.

695. It may be urged that the epithet *ἀγάλακτος* cannot have been used to point out Helen, as she must have been fed at the breast no less than a lion's cub: but the parallel to the *τροφή* of the animal is not the treatment bestowed on Helen in her infancy, but that which she received on her arrival at Troy, so that we may still conceive a *differentia* to have been intended.

728. Such phrases as *γένει πολίτης* Dem. 628. 8, *γένει υἱός* Id. 1081. 7, (Liddell and Scott v. *γένος*) shew that *γένει* here is not to be understood "for" (by way of) "a rate," but must be taken in close connection with *βλαστάνειν*, "springs by lineal descent."

781. In the translation *ἐπραξάμην* has inadvertently been rendered as if it were equivalent to *ἐπραξα*, which of course is not the case.

1128. In the passages where *τί* is used for *ὅτι* it appears more or less strictly to exert its interrogative force, just as in English "what is it" occasionally occurs in the *oratio obliqua* for "what it is." Those who think that such an introduction of the direct interrogation would not be harsh here may recall the comma.















